Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

98 242 AUG 6 1998

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No._____

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1997

IN RE:

Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.

V.

The United States Executive, Et Al.

On Petition for Writs of Mandamus
and Prohibition
To the United States Eleventh
Circuit Court of Appeals

PETITION FOR WRITS OF MANDAMUS AND PROHIBITION

Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
Counsel of Record in Pro Se
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084
Telephone 850-492-0315

97 PP

THE LEGAL QUESTIONS TO THE WRITS AT PARTICULARS BILL TO NISI & UNTO U.S. CONSTITUTION AND U.S. TREATY EXECUTIVE E,95-2, AT ALL PRECEDENT JURISDICTIONS CLAIMED AS INITIATED TO U.S.C. LEGAL CLAIMS AND LEGAL PENDENCIES, AND CONSTRUCTED UNDER U.S. SUPREME COURT RULE 20, AT RETRACTION OF ELEMENTAL BREVITY, FOR REQUISITES IN CLAIRITY AND ACCURACY FORWARD TO SURREJOINDER CAPACITIES

THE FORMAT TO THE QUESTIONS IS SUBORDINATE CLAUSATION AT ORDINATE INTERROGATORY

I. THE QUESTIONS TO APPROPRIETY OF MANDAMUS AT NISI UPON THE U.S. EXECUTIVE, AT JUST CAUSE TO VACATE PORTIONS OF THE JULY 14, 1997 DISMISSAL AT U.S. DISTRICT OF NORTHERN FLORIDA, DURING OUTSTANDING LEGAL PENDENCIES AT U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL ESTUARY AND AT ANTI-TRUST REMAINDERS, DURING F.R.C.P. PROCESS FRAUD DISRUPTION UPON U.S. COLORADO 10TH CIRCUIT DISCOVERY AND DISMISSAL SCHEDULE, THEREFOR AT MANDAMUS REQUISITION ONGOING TO RE-CONSTRUCT U.S. CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS, AND THENCE BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT, UNTO GENERAL LEGAL AND ETHICAL GAINS FOR CONSERVANCY WRIT AT 15 U.S.C.15, 28 U.S.C. 1651, AND 28 U.S.C. 1361 FOR ORDER UPON THE U.S. EXECUTIVE, AND FOR PERMISSIVE REJOINDERS MANDAMUS UPON ANTI-TRUST REMAINDERS AT EVIDENCE FOR U.S. SOVEREIGN SUB-AGENGY WITH SOVEREIGN OF COLORARO MEDICINE

QUESTION ONE TO MANDAMUS

Pending 28 U.S.C. 1291 jurisdictional appropriety abstention and the Eleventh U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals non-stipulation at U.S. Codes upon the dismissal of May 8, 1998, refusing thereafter to file the Petitioner's motion for U.S. Sovereign Judiciary relief from taxation at the unsigned Order of Venue Dismissal, therewith vacating the Petitioner's appropriate pre-dismissal motion for 28 U.S.C. 1254 or for 28 U.S.C. 1251 certification under Supreme Court Rule 19,

IF federal disability instrument were structured from October 1995 U.S. Executive favor limitation, absent to employer overt testiments in dearth of evidence remainders for federal reserve code retroactive and **socially concussive** portrayal of non-existing petitioner employment hebetude, thus portrayed by minority M.D. forbearance upon a D.V.M. proprietary degree and licensure, and

IF grant of limited favor to the instrument at particular disability portrayal, had been preceeded by September 1995 D.V.M. Petitioner validated claim to the Colorado Secretary of State, at initiating legal aperture of U.S. Constitutional estuary fraud from Colorado revised statutes mis-usage, within interstate billing & Sovereign Colorado receiver contract breach foregoing at the SPECIFIC LEGAL INTERESTS of the U.S. Executive, at the claim of disability, and

IF in February 1996, the Sovereign of Alabama medical agent, in pre-decease, did WILLFULLY VIOLATE 42 C.F.R. 1003.101, 102, at federal protection upon a disability instrument at overt medical risk adversity, therein C.F.R. defined as

physician reckless intent to violate the Social Security Act, and

IF the 1996-1998 U.S. Executive had steadfastly dissented to provide UNTO the Petitioner's legal interests, the FORMAL HEARING INGRESS at evidentiary merit AND LEGAL RIGHT for bio-ethical presentment in high medical risk pur-presture, during elements of UNKNOWN CAUSE for private legal representation CONTRACT OPPOSITION to continue at legal representation before the U.S. Executive, during elemental Constitutional estuary fraud from the Sovereign of Colorado, and ultimately

IF the Petitioner's neuro-cardiology symptom at deficit, FOR LEGITIMATE U.S. Executive MEDICAL SANCTION, thrust in 1996, to high medical risk realization, had been CONSTRUCTED FOR ongoing video authentication at **facile** physician CONFIRMATIONS AVAIL AT FUTURES RISK,

WOULD the U.S. Supreme Court's initiating **PRE-CONSENT** for writ at mandamus, not convene in appropriety discernment, that the underlying CAUSE for instrumental reserved federal code refraction upon the the disability grant, may have initiated subordinate to collateral cause liability sheltering, upon the U.S. Sovereign's notation of Petitioner constitutional estuary conflict with Sovereign Colorado in medicine, wherefore: MAY HAVE the U.S. Executive exerted UNCONSTITUTIONAL FEDERAL RESERVE AT EVIDENCE DEARTH, within the disability instrument, foreseeably pre-protective of the U.S. Executive's liability pre-regard to TORT at legal

MARGINS, implicitly INITIATED at Petitioner 1995 VALIDATED CLAIM to the Colorado Secretary, occurring explicitely PRIOR to the Petitioner's finite discovery of high risk medical purpresture, and additionally prior to the Petitioner's legal discovery at physician testimony, that Sherman/Clayton statutory prohibition at verticle contracts monopoly, DID INITIATE before the 1994 U.S. Executive's restrained discernment and/or legal liability, and hence:

SHOULD MANDAMUS BE DUE at statutory fraud, would a preempted and/or an EXCLUDED INERTIA of U.S. Executive legal appropriety DISNULLMENT upon the norms of pragmatic and responsible Branch discernments foreclosure, AT CAUSE FOR MEDICAL REFERRAL TO THE COLORADO SOVEREIGN, not manifest U.S. Executive DISTRIBUTIVE CONSTITUTIONAL CONTEMPT, at need for Judicial Branch RESOLUTE JOINDER INQUIRY at distribution TO CAUSE FOR THE ABSOLUTE DISSENT to call re-hearing upon a legally inert federal instrument of disability, and thence not therefor RECALL THE SOVEREIGN AT MANDAMUS TO HIGH CONSTITUTIONAL/TREATY PURPRESTURE RESERVED PRE-INTENT, formatted explicit at analogs of illegally grafted suppressions in medical risk statutory prohibition enforcement distain, at legal pivot upon claims before U.S. District of Northern Florida, henceforth at dismissal forward, DISRUPTIVE upon the decently comported societal norms and Sovereign balances, CREATED by the U.S. Constitution's commonality reserves unto Sovereign privilege?

QUESTION TWO TO MANDAMUS

Would the Court's continued examination at qualification for writ of mandamus, not

lie at the United States Constitution at Articles IV. Section 2 convention with Articles of Amendments IX. and XIV., asserting not only certain protective rights at U.S. Citizenship, but additionally suggesting the U.S. Constitutional domain of EQUITY WARRANTS IN RESPONSIBILITIES, derived and propelled from those same constitutionally-protected rights, suggestive that **distributive constitutional law at commonality**, might have exerted, some measure in judicial JURISDICTIONAL FOUNDATION EQUITIES purview, particularly during proprietary D.V.M./M.D. INTERNATIONAL RESEVOIRS pre-determinative at medical risk?

QUESTION THREE TO MANDAMUS

IF the United States Sovereign at Constitutional latitudes has appended dissent to U.S. Codes enforcements from Sovereign Alabama violation upon 42 C.F.R. 1003.101, 102, unto U.S. Executive collateral dissent to medical evidentiary rehearing at offended federal instrument of disability,

WOULD the United States Supreme Court's review for consent to mandamus order for disability re-hearing aperture at evidence in medical risk purprestures before the U.S. Constitution and Executive E,95-2, [at universal bio-ethical evidence avail to purpresture redress] not substantially **INQUIRE to the Court's fundamental legal reserve, that the U.S. Constitutional RIGHT TO CONTRACT** before disability claim, had been exerted FORFEIT BY FEDERAL RESERVE, for restitution upon medical risk indemmnity foreclosure at monopoly contracts, during

U.S. Executive AGENCY PARTITION for legal refraction at the U.S. Judiciary's RESERVE,

IF the U.S. Social Security Commissioner did ASSENT on October 24, 1996, to transfer the Petitioner's interlocutory inquiry to the U.S. Surgeon General's Agent [**Dr. Winston Dean**], UNTO THE HHS Inspector General's Office, thereafter resulting in the HHS Inspector General's dissent for responsible U.S. Executive modulative disposition for appropriate aperture in evidentiary re-hearing at the disability instrument, thereafter DENIED RE-HEARING on December 13, 1996, &

IF, the U.S. District of Northern Florida F.R.C.P. process, Rule 8(a) Dismissal stipulation to Petitioner's **BREVITY IMPASSE** upon the arisen interlocutory legal claims RESEVOIRS to legal pendency from U.S. **10TH Circuit**, were inverted at customary usage authorities [cited to the U.S. Court of Appeals, foregoing at AUTHORITIES], exerting at U.S. Northern Florida District ECLIPSING AND SUPPRESSION OF DESCRIPTIVE CARE MANDATE for general substantive due process consideration at suiter rights IN EQUITY UNDER F.R.C.P. Rule 9(a) evidence-collectives by negative averment, and for jurisdictions aperture at F.R.C.P. Rule 19 appropriate rejoinders?

[Please note at Question Three to Mandamus, the Petitioner's June 24, 1998 Affidavit before the Attorney General Proxy Muckle, that the Petitioner at U.S. District of Florida Bar, had *gained* ***local bar prejudice*** *in obtaining replacement legal Counsel before the Court's Bar*]

QUESTION FOUR TO MANDAMUS

IF Origional jurisdiction forward at 28 U.S.C. 1251 from U.S. District Court for the District of Northern Florida was pendent in DUAL state sovereigns reserve to proper rejoinder at such District's CONVERGING jurisdictional assent to F.R.C.P. Rule 19 PROCESS,

WOULD judicial FOREBEARING DISSENT to stipulate judisdictional IMPASSE at 28 U.S.C. 1331, 1346, during advent of F.R.C.P. Rule 19 sovereign rejoinder, not construct mandamus at such origional Supreme Court jurisdiction, TO STIPULATE INTER ALIA AT 15 U.S.C. 15, 28 U.S.C. 2402, 28 U.S.C. 1651, 28.U.S.C. 1361 et seq., for PROPER U.S. District jurisdiction at both U.S. Constitution and at U.S. Treaty Executive E,95-2, and

WOULD U.S. District of Northern Florida failure to convey jurisdictional reserve from the July 14, 1997 Order of Dismissal, not thereafter have UNJUSTLY TAXED CITIZENSHIP PROCESS APPELLATE CONSTRAINT, during the U.S. Court of Appeals May 8, 1998 dismissal equivocation, at **equity-vacated abstention**, to certify proper inquiry at 28 U.S.C. 1251, non-remised to arbitrary process at U.S.C.A. advent in BARRING of costs relief to EXECUTIVE MOTION, while concomitantly denying award at taxation to the Petitioner?

QUESTION FIVE TO MANDAMUS

[PLEASE SEE FAIR INCLUSIONS PETITIONER AFFIDAVIT PROCURATION UPON MAYO FACULTY]

PART ONE

At preliminary sustention of such pre-existing medical risk adversity by the Justices' NOTEFUL assent and joinder with appropriate SIGNED PHYSICIAN TESTIMENT reserves, asserting need for medical caution in general anesthesiology unto U.S. Districts in Colorado, Northern Florida, and Eleventh Circuit Appellate Court [referred at M. Brignole, M.D.],

WOULD mandamus at legally concoursed interrogatives upon the causation for J.S. Executive actions or actions restraints for re-hearing dissent at federal disability instrument, not lie CENTRALLY SUSTAINED at good cause for writ,

IF during outstanding PROCESS IRREGULARITY FRAUD in U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, F.C.R.P. Rule 9(a) LEGAL CONJUGATION OF HIGH MEDICAL RISK ADVERSITY [at CONTRACTUAL BINDING LEGAL INTEREST UPON THE U.S. EXECUTIVE] was infringed at District process by U.S. Postal delivery fraud, *acknowledged in writing by U.S. Magistrate Abram* and by U.S.P.S. Agent Nora Lyons, and

WOULD thereafter, the JOINDER BARRING upon the Petitioner's F.R.C.P. motions avail for appropriate relief unto CONVERGING legal prejudice at dismissal allignment with IMPROPER Order of Protection UPON Sovereign Colorado defendants,

NOT SUGGEST EXPLICIT **GAIN FOR MANDAMUS,** AT CONSTITUTIONAL ESTUARY U.S.P.S. DISRUPTION BY MAGISTRATE'S INCAPACITY FOR EVIDENTIARY RETAINDERS DURING OCCLUDED F.C.R.P. RULE 9(a) DISCOVERY,

should the Colorado Sovereign have been prgmatically INCAPACITED TO PLEAD rebuttals in medical risk appropriety in subject matter?

PART TWO

WOULD the appropriety of like mandamus hereabove unto medical risk adversity PERPETUITY RESTRAINT at the societal norms of commonality joinder with F.R.A.P. PROCESS, convene to good cause at the writ,

IF it might be shown that international cardiology did refer the Petitioner at LEGAL INTEREST under 11th Cir. Rule 28-2(b), to four U.S. autonomic medical specialists, who thereafter did RESTRAIN medical adversity prognostics upon the Petitioner?

PART THREE

WOULD cause at mandamus arise within the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado ELEMENTAL JUDICIAL RULINGS,

IF it might be shown, that during CENTRAL EVIDENCE at medical risk to the Petitioner, that the U.S. District did subjugate Colorado Revised statutory ENTITY conflict with the U.S. Constitution, **at stipulation** that the defendant sovereign was NOT IMPLICITELY LIABLE within any outstanding statutory conversions at analogs to medical practice or medical malpractice, ABSENT to Petitioner's DATE AVAIL EXPIRED REJOINDERS upon individual physician licenses at contract with the Colorado Sovereign, and

IF it might be additionally shown, that U.S. District of Colorado **did receive,** at the defendant sovereign's general pleadings, AN OVERT MEDICAL STANDARDS **MENDACITY** subscribed by the defendant sovereign, unto the 1995 Colorado Judiciary, therein, nationally and internationally CONFIRMED as mendacious, by Michigan State University, by Mayo Faculty of Medicine, and by international physician expert in neurocardiology, and

IF at correspondence to causation for Sovereign of Colorado MENDACITY to the United States Judiciary's reserve for jurisdictional division of U.S. Constitutional entity conflict at C.R.S. statute, SOVEREIGN APPLIED AS MECHANISMIC " INJURY " DETERMINATION by the Colorado sovereign statute, it might be further shown, that Colorado diagnostic REFERRAL CONTRACT disruption before the legal interests of the U.S. Executive, was manifest by physician **SIGNATURES disclosure upon interstate referral injunction,** as having been effected IN ACTIVE INTERSTATE DOMAIN, **by University of Colorado SUB-AGENT from** physician REFERRAL RECEIVER AGENT, at the interstate referral contract, in anti-trust reserve, from 10th Circuit legal pendencies within the U.S. District Court for the Northern Florida District?

QUESTION SIX TO MANDAMUS

IF the Covenant on Human and Political Rights Treaty, Executive E,95-2, were proposed unto the 1977 U.S. Senate, for assent & ratification, as an instrument convened to ETHICAL ENFORCEMENT upon sovereign dissents TO ABIDE within the reasonable norms of appropriate civil law,

absent any extenuating criteria in societal countercurrent, barring the FULL EXTENTION OF CIVIL LAW,

WOULD **any sovereign failure** to subscribe to, or to maintain the general refractive norms of civil law, prescribed at the Treaty, in:

1. THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF JUDICIAL REMEDY [at Article II(3)(b).],

2. THE GARNER OF RESPECT FOR SOVEREIGN LAW AT UNIVERSAL CIVIL EQUITIES [at Article XXVI.],

3. THE PROTECTION FROM **ARBITRARY** INFRINGEMENT BY SOVEREIGN LAW AT DISTRIBUTIVE MEASURE [at Article XVII.]. and

4. THE PROTECTION OF INTRINSIC HUMAN WORTH AT RIGHT TO LIFE IN IN ELEMENTAL PHYSICAL SECURITY [at Article IX.],

NOT THEREAFTER remand to international legal question at causation for U.S. failure at civil judicial process enforcement AT CODES, and hence, present, United States civil codes process failure at *ARBITRARY MEASURE.*

WOULD mandamus at international nisi, derived at cause for bill of particulars at the sovereign's RESERVES TO REFUTE at medical risk [please see appended bill to questions at the writs], NOT THEREFOR ACCEDE to the complement of forereach at REQUISITE ENFORCEMENT upon treaty Executuve E, 95-2, at the explicit U.S. Branch RATIOS OF ILLEGALITY gain at

OFFENSES upon the U.S. Constitutional Citizenship of Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M., within that Sovereign's Court of FINAL RECOURSE,

IF:

1. The BIO-ETHICAL U.S. Constitutional estuary purpresture at question to legal remand before U.S. District Court, in medical risk sovereign and sub-sovereign STATUTORY PROTECTIVE VIOLATION AND STATUTORY ENFORCEMENT FAILURE, was **not** specifically pleaded AS DENIED in the courts below, as extenuated evidentiary REMAINDER upon the sovereigns' NON-REQUITALS at capacities to refute 14th Amendment RISK TO LIFE DEFENSIVE JOINDER,
2. If the Petitioner's SURREJOINDER AT NISI PARTICULARS BILL, during extenuated legal nidus at U.S. Judiciary threshold METER of reserve and/or non-assent to substantive F.R.C.P. due process, resulting in jurisdictions ATTENUATIONS for both prosecution and for BIO-INDEMNITY RESTORATION upon a legally inert federal grant, **MIGHT** REMAND at the Sovereigns' <u>collective inabilities</u> to refute at medical risk counterclaims, and if
3. The ATTRIBUTES outstanding at causation for disruption of United States civil process upon juridictional equities at DISTRIBUTIVE U.S. Constitutional LEGAL attainders by Sovereign Branch authority, REST SEQUESTERED INERT, by the U.S. Judiciary PROCESS **from both the 10th and the 11th U.S. Judicial Circuits,** as coalescing in <u>nullius juris</u> for distributive constitutional EQUIUTY FORWARD?

QUESTION SEVEN TO MANDAMUS

IF the United States Senate did RATIFY AND ASSENT upon United States treaty of Covenant on Human and Political Rights, Executive E,95-2, at the general explicits to ENFORCEMENT AT LAW, subscribed by Mr. Warren G. Christopher's October 5, 1977 presentments and reserves to the graduated implementation of the covenant's articles,

WOULD the United States Senate's ETHICAL ADVISEMENT at treaty ratification, not have suggested the legally PRESERVED INTENT to convene treaty, at co-equity with United States Codes at ethos evolutions from the United States Constitution, and that the United States Executive be held liable for **arbitrary** enforcement reserves upon the Covenant's Articles, at joinders with ANY collateral Executive enforcement failure upon those existing United States Codes, as might subscribe to ethos protection dissents upon human life preservation and security thereof at **BIRTH PROPRIETARY U.S.CITIZENSHIP**?

IF, during DISTRIBUTIVE CONSTITUTIONAL INTERSTATE ***CIVIL*** EQUITIES DISRUPTION before the U.S. Executive, the question of medical risk indemnity FORECLOSURE upon a federal instrument of disability, were legally posited to the U.S. Judiciary's reserved discernment forfeit, alligned JUDICIALLY AT COLLLATERAL U.S. BRANCH FORFEITS upon the explicitely tenured *phasing* of U.S. Citizenship obligations, ***refracted*** to responsible KNOWLEDGE, **at** U.S. Constitutional Article of ***Amendment IX***., juxtaposted thence to

TREATY PREAMBLE, wherefore:

" Realizing that the individual, having duties to other individuals and to the community to which he belongs, is under a responsibility to strive for the promotion and observance recognized in this present Covenant? "

II. THE QUESTIONS TO APPROPRIETY OF PROHIBITION AT NISI UPON THE HONORABLE LACEY A. COLLIER, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, FOR SEGMENTAL VACATION UPON THE JULY 14, 1997 DISMISSAL INDEPENDENCE UNDER F.R.C.P. RULE 8(A) STIPULATED PLEADINGS DISBARRING, EXCLUDING PROHIBITION UPON THE U.S. JUDICIAL QUESTION OF IMPLICIT LEGAL LIABILITY REMAINDERS UPON THE LAWFIRM OF BOOKER AND LASSITER

QUESTION ONE TO PROHIBITION

IF U.S. District Court for the District of Northern Florida, did file the Petitioner's notice of legal pendency and pendency adjoinder pleadings upon SUGGESTION OF U.S. TENTH CIRCUIT process disruption at extraneous **U.S.P.S. FRAUD** upon U.S. Constitutional estuary question AT REJOINDER LIABILITY to medical adversity risks, posited before ELEVENTH CIRCUIT DISCERNMENTS, that *at the Tenth U.S. Judicial Circuit*, the U.S. Magistrate **did subjugate** the discovery schedule at EVIDENCE PROCUREMENTS in medical risk, upon the non-joined legal interests of the U.S. Executive, during U.S. Magistrate NON-

QUALIFICATION to conduct Hearing at Evidence upon U.S. Constutional estuary disruptions in general civil rights,

WOULD merit in writ of prohibition, not initiate at the Supreme Court's ready discernment, that multi-district legal jurisdictions non-assent to EVIDENCE configuration to purprestures at medical adversity risk, DID INITIATE by U.S. Colorado District Magistrate's attenuation of discovery, as was then TRANSFERRED to U.S. District of Northern Florida Judicial reserve, to OVERT NOTICE of U.S.-P.S. FRAUD at intercession upon U.S. DISTRICT OF COLORADO PROCESS [please see Petitioner July 6, 1998 Affidavit before U.S.P.S. General Counsel], and

IF U.S. **Colorado District** due process disruption by U.S.P.S. delivery fraud did intervene FIRST AT AUTHORITY in Hobbs v. Lockhart, 31 Fed. Rules Serv. 3d. 380, PROHIBITING U.S. Magistrate's authority to conduct evidentiary hearing attributes on a motion for judgment at law, thereafter INTERVENING UPON a U.S. District Judge's CONSENT TO JURISDICTION, at AUTHORITY in Park v. Collins, 2 Fed. Rules Serv. 3d. 472, DURING U.S. MAGISTRATE DISSENT TO RECOMMEND JURISDICTION at F.R.C.P. Rule 72(b) process, & THENCE AT SUBSEQUENCE, from Order of Protection **disnullment** upon F.R.C.P. Rule 9(a) Petitioner DISCOVERY, by **THE FIRST** U.S.P.S. non-delivery of March 31, 1997 Article?

QUESTION TWO TO PROHIBITION

WOULD writ of prohibition not particularly

JOIN at good legal cause,

IF U.S. District of Northern Florida F.R.C.P. Rule 8(a) dismissal sanction upon the Petitioner's pleadings, were reversed at AUTHORITY MERIT QUESTION from Vakaria v. Little Co. of Mary Hospital, 917 F. Supp. 1282, [please see Petitioner U.S.C.A. Reply Brief at ECCA Docket 97-3151, page 8,9], and

IF U.S. District Judge, RULING **at perception of U.S.P.S. OBSTRUCTED PROCESS** within U.S. District of Colorado legal pendencies ASSERTED to Northern Florida District, MAY HAVE PERCEIVED ETHICAL REMAINDERS OBJECTIONS,

DERIVED IN DISJOINED OR MARGINALLY CONSTRUCTED F.R.C.P. AUSPICES, sponsored from DUE PROCESS ECLIPSING AT Colorado District U.S. Judicial CONSENT for 28 U.S.C. 1331,1346 jurisdictional MAGISTRATE CONVENED FORFEIT under F.R.C.P. Rule 72(b) recommendation, subconvened therein by U.S. Magistrate NON-AUTHORITY to convene explicit evidentiary hearing, and therein ELICITING HEGEMINALLY RESERVED RULING FORWARD ***DIVERGING PROSPECTUS***, that legal causation for U.S. Constitutional estuary jurisdictional forfeit, may have formatted at ADDITIONAL ***UNKNOWN CAUSE*** FOR DEMERITED EVIDENTIARY FORWARD, impelling IMPROPER U.S. Colorado District dimissal at perpetuity of legal prejudice, AT RESOLUTION TO DUE PROCESS ECLIPSE, from **THE SECOND** U.S.P,S. delivery infringement upon Order of Dismissal Petitioner RECEIPT, thence convening custodial U.S.judicial reserves to advents in F.R.C.P. Petitioner avail for legal prejudice relief convened by U.S.P.S. fraud?

QUESTION THREE TO PROHIBITION

If U.S. District of Northern Florida judicial reserve DID PRE-FOUND the July 14, 1997 Order of Dismissal, at elements of due process subjugation as were JUSTLY PETITIONER REMISED AT LEGAL PENDENCY from the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, set forth and succinctly structured at merit for judicial review and for judicial moulding at elements in disrupted substantive due process at U.S. Constitutional estuaries, conveyed specificially to the U.S. Sovereign's ACTIVE COMPLICITIES, first with the Sovereign of Colorado and thereafter with Sovereign of Alabama, TO SEQUESTER MEDICAL CONTRACT AT ANTI-TRUST COMPLEXION upon a federal disability instrument, and thereafter to deny enforcement of appropriate federal statute, prohibiting medical risk adversity upon the same disability instrument,

WOULD probibition not lie to **REVERSE** UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTORY ATTAINDERS upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment citizenship at large, dwelling at Article IV. Section 2 interlocution of privileges in equities under law, nascent at right to life and security of person, co-sponsored by **treaty** Executive E,95-2 at **Article IX.**, TO JUSTLY REVERSE THE DISRUPTION OF COLLATERALLY SPONSORED TREATY RIGHTS,

IF the U.S. Executive stands at NON-CAPACITY to refute at elemental Petitioner chemical risk subject matter IN SURREJOINDER AT NISI DISTRIBUTION

BILL at questions to the extraordinary writs,

AND IF the **two principle statutes**, configuring UNCONSTITUTIONAL CUSTODIES upon the Petitioner's U.S. Citizenship, appear as Colorado Revised Statute 24-10-109(1), evoked by the Sovereign of Colorado on May 26, 1995, and 20 C.F.R. 416.1465, as a FEDERAL RESERVED CODE suggested as evoked by the U.S. Executive on October 25, 1995, BY " RFC " NOTATION ACTUATION by the Honorable Joseph J. Micare, ALJ,

AND IF the Petitioner RETAINS A LEGAL RIGHT TO SUE FOR U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AND U.S. TREATY RIGHTS EQUITIES AND/ OR FOR INTERLOCUTORY ORDERS AT THE WRITS, UPON THE U.S. JUDICIARY'S AVAIL AS MAY JUSTLY PRE-SUSTAIN THOSE EQUITY RIGHTS **AT UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP** RETENTION, THUS ABSENT IN REQUISITES FOR THE COURT'S PROPER LEAVE, at authority under Barton v. Barbour, 26 L.Ed. 672 [1881]?

QUESTION FOUR TO PROHIBITION

If the U.S. Judiciary has equivocated to process examination at RESERVE in the lower courts, to disrupt the U.S. Executive's DISSENT TO RE-HEAR at evidence to disability in high medical risk remainders-qualification for CONTINUITY OF FEDERAL INSTRUMENT NO. 260 72 6566, at PROCESS proximities to judicial non-equity binding to hear CAUSATION for Federal Reserved Code INSTRUMENTALITY SUPPRESSION upon the federal disability, pending **universal** NON-ENFORCEMENT of existing statutes as might pre-protect the existing federal instrument,

Would Washington v. Glucksberg, 117 S. Ct. 2258 [1997] not intervene at general authority to protect the standing disability instrument at U.S. Constitutional 14th Amendmend Rights, and WOULD American Medical Association v. United States, 63 S.Ct.326 [1943] NOT PRE-ESTABLISH to the Supreme Court's notation, that *prior societal CRIMINAL* CONVICTION upon segmental *physician-class attitudes* in medical *indemnity* **conduct**, might be discernable to CONSTRUCT DETERRING LEGAL PRECEDENCE, that State/Federal instruments at disability determinations at claims, should **NOT be subjected** to U.S. Executive protection at federal process conduits to illegal remainders at non-protected and/or **criminally constructed federal instruments** at criteria in physician dissent to notice elemental medical symptoms at disability claims,

WHEREFOR: WOULD writ of prohibition thence not ISSUE AT JUST LEGAL FUTURES pre-determination, that existing statutes to protect medical disability at indemnification intents by the U.S. Legislature at 42 C.F.R. 1003.-101,102, should be **enforced at equity**, TO DETER NON-LEVELING MEDICAL FRAUD upon federal instruments at claims, or at federal reserve subjugation of claims, therein joining unto the rightful protection upon the individual constitutional RIGHT to private contracts equities reserves, undertaken before State/Federal sanctions at 20 C.F.R. Section 416 PROCESS DISTRIBUTIONS?

QUESTION FIVE TO PROHIBITION AT LEGAL LIGATURE TO MANDAMUS AT **S.CT. RULE 20(2)**

If, during ongoing medical risk purpresture, explict to U.S. Constitutional citizenship attainders perpetuities, any extraordinary writ might lie at mechanismic aperture of legal redress avail exerted explicitely UPON the interlocutory DETAIL, comprising the elements of sovereign forfeits before the U.S. Constitution,

WOULD Petitioner clairity subscription at Supreme Court Rule 20(2) for extraordinary writs binding, not suggest the MERITED co-binding at Petitioner FORWARDS TO **THRESHOLD-COMPREHENSIONS UNITY** AT SUBSCRIPTIVE ACCURACY to the questions before the writs, and

WOULD CONSENT to writ of prohibition not substantially lie at the merited discernment, that such consent might ASSERT as an overrule upon U.S. JUDICIAL reserves in DUAL 10th and 11th U.S. Districts circuits' JURISDICTIONAL FORFEITS, implemented as U.S. Constitutional EQUITIES SEIZURES upon the Petitioner's civil rights, arising within an UNKNOWN QUANTUM OF JUDICIAL PHASING DISSENTS upon the NORMAL ATTRIBUTES of U.S.C. sanctioned F.R.C.P. process?

QUESTION SIX TO PROHIBITION AT U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL ETHICAL REMAINDERS

Suggesting from nicimachean ethics, that justice is a mean at virtued concern with intermediate conditions, therein remanding injustice as an extremity evoking distributive tangible or intangible moral refraction avail, thereafter joining CONCEPTUALLY at Mr. David Hume,

[1711-1776] at INQUIRY CONCERNING THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALS, wherein the laws of any society are perceived evolved as justly internally derived and externally refracted upon the **moral origins** of the constitutions of the governments in question,

IF arising in an appellate cause at evidence in which no final appellate determination was made, but rather, restrained at non-distributive dismissal, sustained only by the U.S. Sovereign defendant's USAGE of Reserved Federal Code [implicit to process at 20 C.F.R. 416.1465], AT LEGAL SHELTER to evidence forbearance remand to proper U.S.C. jurisdictions at legal pendencies inquiry requisites, disallowed at discernment stipulation to the dismissals and thence, CONTINUED at non-equity under F.R.C.P. Rule 9(a) evidentiary collective and Rule 19 rejoinder disbarment upon due process,

WOULD writ of prohibition, **extending to nisi** Petitioner surrejoinder upon U.S. Sovereign **responsive capacities at billings TO QUESTIONS** AT THE WRITS' PETITIONS, evocative at U.S. Executive capacity to EXPLICITELY REFUTE U.S. Constitutional medical risk purpresture upon the Petitioner's attainders claims, ongoing before Articles IV, Section 2, and Articles of Amendments IX. and XIV., suggesting A SUSPENDED U.S. EXECUTIVE LIABILITY FOR NON-DISPOSITIONS AT TANGIBLE EQUITIES DISTRIBUTIONS FAILURES BEFORE THE NORMS OF NICOMACHEAN ETHICAL VALUES, not succinctly lie justified at authoritry from substantive

ETHICAL JOINDERS of causes for probition and mandamus, at QUALIFICATION stipulated at Robertson v. Gessner, 16 So.2d 51, quoted at 55 Corpus Juris Secundum at Section 242,

IF

" Mandamus is not pre-mature where its main purpose is *not* to halt an anticipated default, but to redress and salvage injury from a default already committed. " ,

joining at ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY AT United States v. Oregon Medical Society, 72 S.Ct. 690 [1952] at 2, page 690,

IF

" **Real threat** of future violation of nature likely to continue or recur is sufficient to make cause for relief by injunction, etc. ",

and CONVENED AT AUTHORITY for Writs at nisi surrejoinder in CONSTRUCTIVE KNOWLEDGE, at Feldman v. Lederle Laboratories, 479 A 2d. 374 [1984],

IF

" Constructive knowledge embraces knowledge that should have been known, based on information that was **reasonably available** or obtainable, and should have alerted a reasonaby prudent person to act. " ?

III. THE SUBSIDIARY QUESTION TO THE WRITS AT ETHICALLY VALANCED LEGAL COVARIANTS INTEGRATION WITH U.S. **SUPREME COURT RULE 14(1)(A)**, AT STIPULATED REQUISITES IN FAIR SUBSIDIARY INCLUSIONS UNTO THE GENERAL LEGAL QUESTIONS

AT QUESTIONS OF FAIR VALUES SUBSIDIARY

If the Petitioner's fair inclusions affidavit and its appenda, co-subscribed unto the additional disclosing Petitioner affidavits appended to this petition, suggesting at fair inclusions, that the U.S. Constitutional estuary rights obstruction by Colorado Revised Statute 24-10.109(1), was forwarded from the Colorado judiciary's reserved ruling, unto FRAUDULENTLY ECLIPSED U.S. District of Colorado due process failure at jurisdictional binding during discovery forfeits at evidence to medical risk purpresture, at subsidiary legal binding unto the U.S. Executive's legal interests, and

IF after District of Colorado Hearing of DECEMBER 18, 1996 non-appropos commentary upon the Petitioner's person was thence conjurred at non-dignity U.S. MAGISTRATE PORTRAYAL unto U.S. District Judge ,under F.R.C.P. Rule 72 conveyance,

WOULD both mandamus and prohibition merit at the writs, NOT EXTEND upon the subsidiary question, that federal disability instrument, founded at federal reserved code, assumed as 20 C.F.R. 416.1465, might EXTEND LEGALLY IMPUTED OR EXTRACTED from sequestered documentation or testiments, deleting Petitioner RESPONSIVE ENFRANCHISEMENT at U.S. Executive HEARING WAIVER IN PERPETUITY, refracted at specificity PHYSICIAN FORBEARANCE at the disability instrument's medical claims,

TO HAVE ACKNOWLEDGED, that retroactive Petitioner employment at both professional and non-professional DOMICILES, had been exerted to extremities in recriminations and punitive employment sequelae, ongoing at apparent ETHOS DIVERSITY EXCEPTIONS upon the Petitioner's predominantly heterosexual demeanor, joinding at such diversity exceptions, and derived at employment futures reserves, as were RETROACTIVELY restive at the Petitioner's DISSENTS and WILL to personal privacy, that employment futures NOT DERIVE at physical coersions as a precondition of employment,

IF at Romer V. Evans, 517 U.S. 620 [1998], general prohibition of harassment at employ is sustained,

AND IF, DURING JURISDICTIONAL MERIT IN ADVENTS OF SUCCINCT, **FORESEEABLE**, AND CONSTRUCTIVE KNOWLEDGE AVAIL AT MEDICAL RISK SUBJUGATION UPON A FEDERAL DISABILITY INSTRUMENT, THE U.S. DISTRICT N.D. FLA. COURT DID PROFANE AT MARGINED ONUS UPON THE U.S. CONSTTITUTION, AT FORBEARING DISMISSAL RESERVES, TO TENDER **ANY** U.S. CODE STIPULATION UPON THOSE PROPER JURISDICTIONS CONFIGUREMENTS AS WERE ARISEN IN ADEQUACY OF PETITIONER AUTHORITES AT CITATION FOR CONVENTION OF PROPER U.S. DISTRICT *ANTI-TRUST PENDENCY JURISDICTIONS AT U.S. CONSTITUTION AND AT U.S. TREATY,*

THEREAFTER *CO-SUSTAINED AT ONUS OF NON-SIGNED FORFEIT BY 11TH U.S. CIRCUIT APPELLATE TRIBUNAL AT PROCESS DISMISSAL* IN U.S.C. NON-STIPULATED **ARBITRARY** MEASURE BEFORE 28 U.S.C. 1251 AND BEFORE 28 U.S.C. 1254, SUB-CONVENED AT 11TH CIRCUIT REFUSAL TO FILE PETITIONER MOTION FOR STAY?

IV. THE QUESTIONS TO **NISI SURREJOINDER** AT THE PETITIONS FOR MANDAMUS AND PROHIBITION WRITS, CO-CONSTRUCTED UPON THE PETITIONER'S APPENDIX AFFIDAVITS

Can the U.S. Judiciary **at F.R.C.P. process fraud and ethical ecplise**, can the U.S. Executive **at abuse and consent for abuse** upon a federal disability instrument, and can any additional party, bearing legal interest or witnessed reserves at amicus or non-amicus to SURREJOINDER AT NISI herewith foregoing, substantially at fact, or at factual subsidiaries reserves, REFUTE AT RETRORSE COUNTERCLAIM IN LEGITIMATE FOREKNOWLEDGED RESPONSIBILITY foregoing UPON SUBJECTIVE RESOLUTIONS critera to PROTECT, before the U.S. Supreme Court's Bar at consideration for Writs at Mandamus and Prohibition, the U.S. Constitutional Citizenship **RIGHTS of the Petitioner**, contingent of/or within VERACITY COALESCING unto the subjective MEDICO-LEGAL ISSUES:

THAT AT QUESTION ONE AT NISI,

AT the onset of disability claim #260 72 6566, at potential chemical injury by **Florida licensed distributor** in xylocaine admission, that the generally recognized chemical-class toxicities of the LOCAL ANESTHESTIC DRUGS, **were DUE at the U.S. Executive's** RESPONSIBLE ***recognitions***, that both brain membrane physicial PENETRATIONS and membrane fluidizations [contingent at pH tissues variance at acidity or alkalinity], and HEART DAMMAGE by sodium channel ELECTRO-CONDUCTIVITY

disruption, might well HAVE INITIATED good cause for the Petitioner's claim of 1993 organic medical disability, BEYOND U.S. Judiciary and U.S. Executive PORTRAYALS upon collateral Petitioner psychologic difficulty **at de facto physical condition of neurochemical homeostasis change** [please see appendum to Fair Inclusions Affidavit at U.S. Deputy Clerk Ehrlich, referred to U.S. Magistrate Abram's **PORTRAYALS**]?

THAT AT QUESTION TWO AT NISI

Upon grant of limited medical favor to claim 260 72 6566, THE JUDICIAL WAIVER of hearing did construct the Petitioner's inability to conduct appropriate physician sworn testimony referred at the ongoing medical symptom of impaired brainstem modulated reflex, REGULATING CARDIOVASCULAR stability, and LIMITING the Petitioner's RESIDUAL ability to obtain and MAINTAIN employment?

THAT AT QUESTION THREE AT NISI

The HHS AGENCY JURISDICTIONAL DISSENT TO ENFORCE statutory medical risk prohibition at 42 C.F.R. 1003.101,102 did PRE-CONSTRUCT the continuity of FEDERAL RESERVE STATUTE 20 C.F.R. 416.1465 at administrative judicial EVIDENTIARY SEQUESTIONS AT CLAIM PROCESS [if any], thereafter CO-CONSTRUCTING ***LEGAL SHELTER*** upon the U.S. Executive, ***at ANTI-TRUST*** pendency structure from Sovereign of Colorado 1994 participation at instrument 260 72 6566 [Please see Sworn Affidavit to Sovereign Colorado Counsel, dated July 6, 1998].

THAT AT QUESTION FOUR AT NISI

Upon initial Colorado Judiciary non-prejudice to legal forward of civil contract breach estuary at the interstate medical referral disruption, that the Petitioner DID ACCEDE TO JUDICIAL VERBAL RECOMMENDATION, **to co-operate with the Colorado medical sovereign,** and that during FIFTEEN months of re-inquiry including C.U. Chairman of Anesthesiogy's WRITTEN CONSENT for review, that University of Colorado Counsel did apparently INTERVENE LEGALLY upon **Chairman Gibb's preliminary May 1996 ASSENT for review in medical safety,** therein RESULTING in October 1996 Constitutional estuary complaint at C.F.R. 24-10-109-1 Federal QUESTION?

THAT AT QUESTION FIVE AT NISI

Ongoing before 1994-95 Sovereign Colorado medical diagnostic/prognostic CONTRACT BREACH, STOOD ELEMENTAL HIGH MEDICAL RISK to the Petitioner in general anesthesiology upon BRAINSTEM PATHOLOGY SYMPTOM of vaso-vagal reflex failure, also known as baro-reflex, or baro-receptor reflex ?

THAT AT QUESTION SIX AT NISI

During like vaso-vagal paralysis, the DISTURBANCE TO **NEURAL MEMBRANES** IS suggested at possible cause from 1993 TOXIC FLUIDIZATIONS UPON ENZYMES WHICH REGULATE BRAIN FUNCTION AT **OXYGEN DISTRIBUTIONS** TO THE neurons, setting forth the medical question to PROCEDURAL RISK ATTENTUATIONS PORTENTS,

that the FOUNDING ESTUARY OF MEDICAL RISK DISSENT TO ATTENTUATION, **was constructed by the Sovereign of Colorado in medicine**, DURING the 1994-1995 contract breach AT U.S. EXECUTIVE LEGAL INTERESTS at disability claim 260 72 6566, and that the succinct SUBJECTIVE APERTURES FOR MEDICAL RISK ATTENTUATION, are Petitioner CONSTRUCTED at June 14, 1998 NOTARIZED PROCURATIONS before Mayo Faculty of Medicine staff members, John D. Michenfelder and Stephen P. Hammill, NOTEFUL to the PRIMARY chemical risk ATTRIBUTES of the general anesthetics, that *SUBSTANTIAL* FUNCTIONAL VARIATIONS AMONG THE ANESTHETICS, DOES EXIST, at the ability of these chemicals to SUPPRESS BRAIN *OXYGEN* METABOLISM, SPECIFICALLY UPON THE ***OXYGEN DISTRIBUTION*** *TO ACETYLCHOLENE TYPE NERVES*, which do **govern** cardiovasculal vaso-vagal AUTOMATICITY, at joining RISK ATTENUATION RESERVES, for physician foreknowledged **POTENTIAL** ABILITY to prevent FLUID GAUNTLETS DESTRUCTIONS upon ajacent **REPIRATORY** CONTROL CENTERS during need to anesthetize patients at vaso-vagal reflex symptomatic **failure** [***Please*** see Petitioner June 24, 1998 MEDICAL STANDARDS PROCURATIONS upon Mayo Faculty of Medicine at the Petition's Appendix]?

THAT AT QUESTION SEVEN AT NISI

U.S. Attorney General LEGAL EQUIVICATIONS set forth during Petitioner disclosures at ANTI-TRUST REMAINDERS liability upon the U.S. Executive, are succinctly TENABLE AT DUE PROCESS PROSECUTORY AVAIL, during the HHS Secretary's resolute FORFEITS upon the U.S. Constitutional rights at disability instrument 260 72 6566 [Please see June 24, 1998 Petitioner Affidavit

before U.S. Attorney General Proxy, Verna N. Muckle]?

THAT AT QUESTION EIGHT AT NISI

While U.S. Legislature proceeds at on-going PROTECTIVE STATUTORY DISCRETIONARY REQUISITES FUTURES MONITOR UPON HEALTH **CARE INDEMNITY** FRAUD upon the Treasury [P.B.S. News, 7-15-98, Maryland Senator, HMO ***medical risk at public issue***], NO U.S. Legislative PROHIBITION for medical indemnity RATIONING AT PRIVATELY-PAID contracts exists at 1998 statutes,pre-eminent AT the U.S. Legislature's ENACT-MENT of statutory protection upon U.S. INSTRUMENTS of medical disability?

THAT AT QUESTION NINE AT NISI

The Sovereign of Florida Treasurer's 1997 refusal to enforce F.S. sanction for Petitioner SIGNATORY RELEASE upon Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Florida ATTORNEY SEQUESTERED MEDICAL REPORTS from State of Florida License in Oral Surgery, RESTS at 1998 Florida Treasurer's MEDICAL INDEMNITY ACTUARY SEQUESTRATION, at **unknown legal attributes** before this Petition and/or before the U.S. Constitutional rights of the Petitioner?

AND THAT AT QUESTION TEN AT NISI

The medical standards of INDEMNITY ACTUARY FOREKNOWLEDGE, that the human brainstem DOES REGULATE CARDIO-VASCULAR STABILITY, **IS ONGOING KNOW-LEDGE FROM YEAR 1870**, and hence, likely PRE-FORMATTED upon the U.S. Executive's

and the Colorado Sovereign's RESPONSIBLE PERCEPTIONS, both prior to and subsequent to initiation of federal instrument 260 72 6566, that constructive knowledge, **UNCONSTITUTIONALLY** USURPED BY FEDERAL RESERVED CODE 20 C.F.R. 416.1465, AND BY COLORADO REVISED STATUTE 24-10-109(1) during U.S. EXECUTIVE CONSTRUCTED SHELTER UPON ANTI-TRUST COLORADO PHYSICIAN ACTIVITY before the federal instrument,

MAY THEREFOR STAND AT CAUSATIONS PAR EXCELLENCE FOR BOTH MANDAMUS AND FOR PROHIBITION AT THE WRITS?

{ At medical risk purpresures GAINS, **initiated by the Colorado Sovereign,** and thereafter ***SANCTIONED*** by the U.S. Executive's ONGOING JURISDICITIONAL FAILURE to enforce U.S. Legislative STATUTORY PROHIBITIONS OF MEDICAL RISK to federal instruments at 42 C.F.R. 1003.-101,102, *VIOLATED* by the 1996 Sovereign of Alabama Faculty of Medicine at Mobile, Alabama [Please see Petitioner FAIR INCLUSIONS AFFIDAVIT at the Petition's Appendix, notarized on June 19, 1998 before the COLORADO ATTORNEY GENERAL] }?

AND THAT AT QUESTION ELEVEN AT NISI

The Sovereign of Alabama U.S. N.D. FLA. Defendancy's 1996 WILLFUL VIOLATION of 42 C.F.R. 1003.101,102 medical risk prohibition, may have occurred subsequent to the 1994 Soverign faculty's **9TH Amendment INTERDEPENDENT** NON-CONTRACT DISBURSEMENT RESERVE before the lawfirm of Booker and Lassiter, at non-dislosures to the Petitioner AT CLAIM 260 72 6566?
[Please see Appendix AT DISCLAIMER]?

THAT AT QUESTION TWELVE AT NISI

During the lower court's dismissals, the U.S. and the Alabama Sovereigns' espousal that the LEGAL ISSUE of state-federal qualification for SUBSTANTIVE/DISCRETIONARY functional immunity, was UNMET in legal merit, in that at Barnes v. O'Dale, 530 So.2d 770,784 (Alamama 1988), [juxtaposed legally at succinct medical risk purpresture during Sovereign of Alabama overt VIOLATION of 42 C.F.R. 1003.101,102], the Alabama Supreme Court did remand **at LEGAL EXCEPTIONS** STIPULATION, that pending HARM DUE at public liability, like functional Sovereign immunity was **UNQUALIFIED**?

AND THAT FINALLY AT QUESTION THIRTEEN TO **INTERNATIONAL NISI** AT TREATY VIOLATION BY THE U.S. EXECUTIVE UPON ARTICLES XVII. AND IX. AT EXECUTIVE E,95-2

If the federal statutes enacted from U.S. Constitutional ETHOS PARITY, conferred at BRANCH POWERS equities with treaty Executive E,95-2, were REFUSED U.S. Executive enforcements at protection from sub-sovereign imposition of medical risk at University of South Alabama, hence offending U.S. legislative auspices for BOTH statutory and treaty enactment, would such VARIANCE at enforcement forfeit, not reflect as INTERNATIONAL ***ARBITRARY*** U.S. EXECUTIVE IRRESPONSIBILITY of retroactive disrespect for the U.S. ELECTORATE, arising as an APOLITICAL and SUCCINCTLY SEGREGATED NON-DETERMINATE, arcane at CAUSATION upon the supervening ETHOS VARIANCE?

THE LISTING OF THE RESPONDENTS TO THE PETITION AT ORDER OF PETITIONER REQUEST OF RESPONSE

I. **THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF COLORADO** AT FUNCTION OF OATH-BEARING RESPONSIBILITY TO DEFEND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

II. **THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF FLORIDA** AT FUNCTION OF RESPONSIBLE SOVEREIGN PARTY TO BEAR JUST WITNESS UPON THE POTENTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS UPON THE PETITIONER'S STATE OF FLORIDA CITIZENSHIP

III. **THE OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN IN ANESTHESIOLOGY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA**, AT RESPONSIBLE FUNCTIONARY PARTY OF THE SOVEREIGN OF ALABAMA TO SHOW CAUSE OR REBUTTAL FOR THE 1996 IMPOSITION OF MEDICAL RISK UPON THE PETITIONER

IV. **THE OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN IN ANESTHESIOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO [C.U.] MEDICAL CENTER AND/OR CHARLES P. GIBB, M.D.** AT SOVEREIGN FUNCTIONAL CONSTRUCTIVE FOREKNOWLEDGE AND VIDEO WITNESS OF THE PETITIONER'S MEDICAL SYMPTOMATIC SIGNELMENT BEFORE 1996-1997 U.S. DISTRICT CIVIL ACTION NO. 96-D-2506

V. **THE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE** AT OATH-BEARING FUNCTIONAL OBLIGATION TO PROTECT AND DEFEND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, TO SHOW CAUSE UPON THE SOVEREIGN'S FORFEIT TO GRANT MEDICAL RE-HEARING UPON FEDERAL DISABILITY INSTRUMENT

V. **THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL**, AT FUNCTION OF ENFORCEMENTS OBLIGATION AT UNITED STATES LAW AND TREATY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE LEGAL QUESTIONS FOR CONSENT TO MANDAMUS

A. Question One-The Issues at **Pre-Consent**, pp. i.-ii.

B. Question Two-The Questions at U.S. Constitutional Distributive Control, pp. ii.-iii.

C. Question Three-The Questions at Collateral Contracts Distributions Non-Preservation at U.S. Sovereign Responsible Forfeit, pp. iii.

D. Question Four-The Issues at Jurisdictional Impasse and Equities Abstention, pp.iv.

E. Question Five-The Legal Issues defining **Obstructions** upon Due Process or Judicial Discovery at medical risk, at legal GAIN within the ***10th U.S. Judicial Circuit***, pp.iv.-v.

F. Question Six-The Issues at U.S. **Treaty** in Arbitrary Measures **Violation** by the U.S. Sovereign, pp. v.-vi.

G. Question Seven-The Issues of U.S. Senate legal interest in the **Arbitrary** Non-Preservation upon the Petitioner's U.S. Citizenship by BOTH the U.S. Executive, ***and*** the U.S. Judiciary, pp. vii.

II. THE LEGAL QUESTIONS FOR CONSENT TO PROHIBITION

A. Question One-The Initiating Issues Merit at Due Process AUTHORITY NON-PRESERVATION at

legal pendency 10th Circuit **commonlaw** violations, drawn to the attention of the 11th Circuit U.S. District Court, pp. vii.-viii.

B. Question Two-The Joinder Issues at Good Cause, suggesting **NON-AUTHORITY JUDICIAL HEGEMONAL PROSPECTUS** legal interfacing dissent and forfeit to medical risk Evidentiary Discovery in the 11th Circuit, pp viii.

C. Question Three-The Issues of U.S. Constitutional & Treaty Justification for Prohibition, pp. ix.

D. Question Four-The Issues at the **Authorities to Re-Construct** Federal Disability Medical Foundation, pp. x.

E. Question Five-The **THRESHOLDS UNITY** COMPREHENSIONS MANDATE pp. x.

F. Question Six-The Extension at RATIONAL Nicomachean ethics for the Court's Consideration at **NISI SURREJOINDER**, pp. xi.

III. The Subsidiary Controlling Issues to The Extraordinary Writs at Fair Value, pp. xii.

IV. The Questions at NISI SURREJOINDER, pp. xii.-xvi.

V. The Recitations at Supreme Court Rule 29(4)(b)(c), pp. 1.

VI. The Ennumerated Listings and Detailed Responses at Petitioner Requests, pp. 1-6.

VII. The Linear Ruling Citations, pp. 6-7.

VIII. **The Jurisdictional Reserve, pp. 7.**

IX. The Verbatum Authorities Citations, pp. 7-10

X. The Concise Statement of the Case At Legal Conversions, pp. 10-11.

XI. The **Amplification** of Legal Reserves at Discretional Functional Immunity, pp. 11-13.

XII. The Petitioner Statement of Counsel at Record, pp. 13-14

XIII. The Petitioner Declaration of NON-CORPORATE ENTITY, pp. 14.

XIV. The Petitioner Suggestion of **Solitary Relief Avail** at the U.S. Supreme Court's Bar, pp 14.

XV. The Closure of the Petition, pp. 14.

XVI. The Supreme Court First Docket Publishment Petitioner Declaration of the ERRATA to the Honorable Mr. Justice Kennedy, pp. 15.

XVII. The APPENDIX TO THE PETITION pp. a-i.-a-v. and the appended affidavits ennumerated on page a-v. absent to pagination at the Petition for Writs

XVIII. THE TABLE OF AUTHORITIES AND LEGAL CITATIONS, pp. xx.-xxi.

THE TABLE OF AUTHORITIES AND LEGAL CITATIONS AT TITLES INTEGRATION

I. THE U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AND TREATY AUTHORITIES

A. Article One Section 10, pp. 10
B. Article IX Section 2, pp. iii., ix., xi., 5, 8.
C. Article of Amendment IX, pp. iii., vii., xi., xv.
D. Article of Amendment XIV., pp iii., iv., vi., x., xi., 5, 7.
E. Executive E,95-2, pp. i.,iv.,v., vi., vii., ix., xvi., 5, 6, 8.

II. THE LEGISLATIVE ACTS
A. The Social Security Act, pp. 11.
B. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, pp. 13

III. THE AUTHORITIES AT UNITED STATES CODES AND COLORADO REVISED CODE
A. 28 U.S.C. 2402, pp. iv.
B. 28 U.S.C. 1251, pp. i., v., xii., 2, 3, 5, 6, 7,.
C. 15 U.S.C. 15, pp. i.,iv., 6.
D. 15 U.S.C. 4, pp. 6, 7, 10, 11.
E. 28 U.S.C. 1651, pp. i., iv.
F. 28 U.S.C. 1291, pp. i.
G. 28 U.S.C. 1331, pp. iv., viii., 7.
H. 28 U.S.C. 1346, pp. iv.,viii., 7, 12, 13
I. 28 U.S.C. 1254, pp. i.. vii., 8.
J. 28 U.S.C. 1361, pp. i., iv.
K. 28 U.S.C. 2403(a), pp. 1.
L. 20 C.F.R. 416.1465, pp. xi., xii., xv.
M. C.R.S. 24-10-109(1), PP. ii.,

ix., vii., xiv., xv., 1, 2, 6, 7, 9.

N. 42 C.F.R. 1003.101,102, pp. i., iii., x., xii., xiii., xv., xvi., 3, 4, 9, 12, 13.

IV. THE AUTHORITIES AT THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURES AND AT THE FEDERAL LOCAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

A. F.R.C.P. Rule 8(a), pp. iii., iv., xi.

B. F.R.C.P. Rule 9(a), pp. iii., iv., viii., xi.

C. F.R.C.P. Rule 19, pp. iii., iv., xi.

D. F.R.C.P. Rule 72, pp. viii., xii.

E. 11th Cir. R. 28.2(b), pp. v.

V. THE ALPHABETICAL CITATIONS OF CASES AT LEGAL AUTHORITIES TO THE PETITION

A. American Medical Association v. United States, 63 S. Ct. 326 [1943], pp. x.

B. Barnes v. O'Dale, 530 So.2d. 770, 784, pp. xvi.

C. Barton v. Barbour, 26 L. Ed. 672, pp. ix., 8.

D. Bigbee v. Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co., 34 Cal.3d. 49, pp. 6

E. Dalehite v. United States, 346 U.S. 15, pp. 12, 13.

F. Downs v. United States, 522 F.2d. 996, pp. 12

G. Feldman v. Lederle Laboratories, 479 A.2d, 374 [1984], pp. xi.

H. Hobbs v. Lockhart, 31 Fed. Rules Serv. 3d. 380, pp. viii.

I. Jenning v. Davis, 476 F.2d. 1271

pp. 8,9,

J. Marbury v. Madison, Dist. Col. [1803], 5 U.S. 137, pp. 9

K. Park v. Collins, 2 Fed. Rules Serv 3d. 472, pp. viii.

L. Robertson v. Gessner, 16 So.51, pp. xi.

M. Romer v. Evans, 517 U.S. 620, pp. xii.

N. United States v. Oregon Medical Society, 72 S.Ct. 690, pp. xi., 8.

O. Vakaria v. Little Co. of Mary Hospital, 917 F. Supp. 1282, pp. viii., 10

P. Vasco v. Quill, 117 S.Ct. 2293, pp. 13

Q. Washington v. Glucksberg, 117 S. Ct. 2258, pp. 8.13.

THE PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRITS AT U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL & TREATY COMMONLAW PROTECTION

I. THE RECITATIONS AT U.S. SUPREME COURT RULE 29.4(B)(C)

A. At **unconstitutional** question of U.S. Executive instrumental application of 20 C.F.R. 416.-1465 federal reserved code upon federal disability instrument 260 72 6566, the Petitioner certifies to the Court that 28 U.S.C. 2403(a) may apply, as neither U.S. N.D. Fla. nor 11th Circuit U.S.C.A. at Dockets 3;97CV59/LAC or ECCA 97-3151 did certify to United States Attorney General.

B. At unconstitutional LEGAL PENDENCY within U.S. N.D. Fla. Court, from **10th Circuit** U.S. Colorado District, at U.S. constitutional entity estuary PROCESS FRAUD at usages question at Colorado Revised Statutes 24-10-109(1) [referred at U.S. Colorado District Civil Action No. 96-D-2506], the Petitioner certifies to the Court that 28 U.S.C. 2403(a) may apply, as U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado did fail to certify to United States Attorney General at constitutional federal question.

II. THE ENUMERATED RESPONDENTS LISTING VIS-A-VIS THE AVAILED PARTICULARITIES RESPONSES AT NISI SURREJOINDER TO MEDICAL RISK PURPRESTURE, FORMATTED AT DUAL LEGAL APPLICATIONS,

FIRST AT U.S. SUPREME COURT **RULE 15.2** FOR THE RESPONDENT'S COURT-DIRECTED OBLIGATIONS, AND THEN AT THE PARTICULAR SOVEREIGNS' CO-EQUITIES OF OBLIGATIONS UNTO U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL ARTICLE OF AMENDMENT IX., THENCE PENDING RESPONSIVE WAIVERS, CREATING PETITIONER MOTION AVAIL AT NISI PARTICULARS BUFFER, TO SUBJECT MATTER NON-REFUTALS SOVEREIGNS' CAPACITIES, ONGOING BEFORE ADDITIONAL SUPREME COURT RULES 20.2 AND 20.3, **CONVERGING** AT RULE 14.1(A) UNTO FAIR-INCLUSIONS SUBSIDIARY LEGAL QUESTIONS, CO-BUFFERED WITH THE VARIOUS SOVEREIGN RESPONDENTS' INTENTS OR MANIFESTS FOR COMMONLAW **VIOLATIONS**, DURING ORIGIONAL 1995 MEDICAL RISK CONTRACT PURPRESTURE AT VERTICLE CONTRACTS MONOPOLY MANIFEST

UNTO THE OFFICE OF THE COLORADO SOVEREIGN ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE HON. GAIL NORTON

At the **1995 ARBITRARY** manifests of the of the Colorado Sovereign judiciary's JULY MISUSAGE OF C.F.R. 24-10-109(1) as an instrument of **quasi**-medical determination at LEGAL PRE-FACITING upon a Sovereign-breached privately PAID CONTRACT for medical prognostics at legal interests to the 1995 U.S. Executive, theafter DISTAINED TO Colorado Attorney General legally sanctioned inquiry at C.R.S. 24-10-109(2) during Sovereign of Florida SOLE judicial liability for determinaing the advent of INJURY OR NON-INJURY to the Petitioner,

The Petitioner respectfully requests the Attorney General's NOTATION and LEGALLY APPROPRIATE RESPONSES to the questions at NISI and NISI SURREJOINDERS to the extraordinary writs.

Herein, the Petitioner notes that origional jurisdiction at 28 U.S.C. 1251 may apply as the court of final resort at dual state sovereigns U.S. Constitutional and Treaty Rights offences.

Inclusive to the Petitioner's request of the Attorney General's responses at nisi, the Petitioner PREFIGURES upon the Attorney General's **Oath to defend the U.S. Constitution** during overtly declared U.S. District of Colorado DUE PROCESS FRAUD, disrupting Civil Action No. 96-D-2506 by Magistrate-declared U.S.P.S. non-receipts at Petitioner foreswearing veracity of mailing. Therein at Petitioner PRESUMPTION of Attorney General Oath at goodwill before Article IV. Section 2 AT Petitioner NON-RESIDENCY in Colorado, and therein ATTACHED to Averment 4 of July 19, 1998 appended FAIR-INCLUSIONS AFFIDAVIT, **causing** the U.S. Constitutional Claims recited at Petitioner's 1995 VALIDATED CLAIM to Colorado Secretary Buckley, the Petitioner additionally respectfully requests the Attorney General's responses to the INTENTS OF U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT CONSERVANCY AT THE WRITS, joinded subjectively upon the C.U. Chairman of Anesthesiology's capacity or non-capacity to REFUTE the Petitioner's ongoing medical risk claims at Sovereign purpresture.

UNTO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF FLORIDA

The Petitioner respectfully requests

the Attorney General's responses before C.R.S. 24-10-109(1) Sovereign Colorado judicial *assumption of injury*, delegating pre-prejudice unto the Sovereign of **Florida's judicial reserves at civil liabilities** convened appropriate at QUESTION ONE to NISI SURREJOINDER, IF the Petitioner did file U.S. Constitutional VALIDATED COMPLAINT in 1995 before the Sovereign of Colorado Secretary of State, at Colorado Revised Statutes MISUSAGE, occurring collateral with U.S. Magistrate 1997 **residual determination** of medical malpractice unto such PORTENT OF INJURY. The Petitioner additioinally requests the Attorney General's *appropriate legal response*, IF in 1997, the Office of the Florida Sovereign Treasurer, **did REFUSE** to enforce Florida Statute sponsored PETITIONER SIGNATORY RELEASE upon a document sequestered by Blue Cross/ Blue Shield of Florida, sujectively related to the PORTENT of Petitioner injury within the Sovereign of Florida. The Petitioner acknowledges 28 U.S.C. 1251 probable jurisdiction of final resort before the Florida Attorney General, at legal regard before Colorado Sovereign physician diagnostic and prognostic **fraud** at potential March 26, 1993 chemical injury occurring to the petitioner within the Sovereign of Florida.

UNTO THE SOVEREIGN OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN OF UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ANESTHESIOLOGY, AS SUBSTITUTED AT F.R.C.P. UNITED STATES 11TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DUE PROCESS

The Petitioner respectfully requests the Chairman's responses at nisi to the extraordinary writs at **commonlaw violation** upon 42 C.F.R. 1003.101,-102, at the Petitioner's request for the Chairman's adhesing disclaiming refutals to the Petitioner's assertions of outstanding medical risk purpresture, convened by University of South Alabama's INTENT before Sovereign of Alabama Counsel, Mrs. Maxey J. Roberts, **if video evidence** at deposit to U.S. N.D. Fla. Court, shows both Petitioner reasonably AUTHENTICATED failure at baro-reflex, and the Petitioner's DEPOSIT of proof of State/Federal QUALIFICATION for Sovereign medical safety review general anesthesiology.

The Petitioner acknowledges before the Chairman of Anesthesiology that United States Supreme Court aperture of jurisdiction at 28 U.S.C. 1251 stands as court of final recourse and solitary AVAIL, **to show ligation:** [unto medical risk **INTERSTATE COLORARO-ALABAMA CONTRACT FRAUD** in supressing commerce, opened to U.S. Executive legal interests at federal disability 260 72 6566] UNTO ***REFUSED*** MEDICAL PROTECTION BY 1996 Soverign Anesthesiology Chair, the deceased John N. Miller, M.D.

Hence, the Petitioner respectfully refers the Chairman's potential rebuttal responses, before the APPENDED PROCUREMENTS in outstanding medical risk, remitted before Dr. Michenfelder and Dr. Hammill.

UNTO THE C.U. OFFICE OF CHAIR IN ANESTHESIOLOGY AND/OR CHARLES P. GIBB, M.D.

Extending from the C.U. Officer of Anesthesiology's 1996 receipt of video evidence at the Petitioner's medical symptom in vaso-vagal [baro-reflex] failure subsequent to carotid sinus [neck pressure] at cardiac rate NON-RESPONSE, sealed on January 31, 1997 before U.S. District of Colorado LOCAL RULES,

EVOKING MEDICAL SUGGESTION of **acetylcholene** nerve OXYGEN ENZYME physical PERTURBATION,

The Petitioner, acknowledging U.S. Supreme Court as Court of final recourse, and additionally ACKNOWLEDGING the CHAIRMAN'S **functionary possession** of constructive medical knowledge in ability to either confirm or refute upon the Petitioner's MEDICAL RISK PROCUREMENTS at Mayo College of Medicine, respectfully **requests** the Chairman's RESPONSES AT NISI AND AT NISI SURREJOINDER for conservancy writs to protect U.S. Citizenship, at complements to the responses, to establish unto the U.S. Supreme Court's discernment of outstandingly high medical risk purprestures gain during ongoing civil dispute, **at SPECIFIED FACTORS**, acknowledged by Calgary and Harvard Professors Keith Miller, M.D. and Sheldon Roth, M.D., at medical reference text, MOLECULAR AND CELLULAR MECHANISMS OF ANESTHETICS (at the TABLES on pages 455-470) **REFERRED:**
THAT **ACETYLCHOLENE** METABOLIC OXYGEN

DELIVERY SUPPRESSION, appears at **extensive variability** at 47 general anesthetics [please see C50 post-synaptic n-acetylcholene receptor blockade]. Wherefore: the Petitioner respectfully requests the Chairman's concurrance or discord at these PUBLISHED STRUCTURAL/CHEMICAL ACTIVITY VARIATIONS CAPACITIES **to alter oxygen metabolics**, and appends additional request for the Chairman's confirmation OR denial, that these published DATA, **might facillitate** physician foreknowledged *ABILITY*, along with other medically appropriate measures **at avail**, TO ATTENTUATE MEDICAL RISK IN GENERAL ANESTHESIOLOGY, upon a patient presenting, pre-anesthesis, with symptom of vaso-vagal reflex paralysis, at PARTICULAR ANATOMICAL PROXIMITY WITH THE ***RESPIRATORY CONTROL CENTERS*** regulating, AT SUCCINCT RISK OF FLUID PRESSURES *NON-REVERSIBLE* BRAIN DAMMAGES, EXTENDING FROM PHYSICIAN *INABILITY TO MAINTAIN PROPER BLOOD OXYGEN DELIVERY* AT THE **PRESUMPTIVE SITE** OF VASO-VAGAL OXYGEN METABOLIC DELIVERY PERTURBATION.

UNTO THE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE PARTITIONED AT THE OFFICES OF SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, HHS INSPECTOR GENERAL, AND COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The Petitioner respectfully requests the U.S. Executive's responses upon the detailed **legal gains** at nisi and at nisi surrejoinder thresholds of **mounting evidence** at medical risk purpresture, that 20 C.F.R. 416.1465 AT FEDERAL

RESERVE, appears during U.S. Executive usage, as an instrument of medical EVIDENTIARY RE-HEARING FORECLOSURE *upon disability instrument 260726566*, when, on October 24, 1996, the Commissioner of Social Security did APPROPRIATELY FORWARD to the HHS Inspector General, the Petitioner's subject matter justifications in medical risk evidentiary adversity prospectus, as were on that date, LEGALLY DUE unto the HHS Inspector General's dispositions of responsible FUNCTIONARY KNOWLEDGE, as should have resulted in proper investigation to RE-HEAR the newly constructed evidence of **COMPILED DISABILITY** at federal instrument 260 72 6566.

The Petitioner additionally requests the U.S. Executive's **proper** responses to determine the cause of the HHS Secretary's June 17, 1996 LEGAL FORFEIT OF JURISDICTION TO ENFORCE medical adversity prohibition at 42 C.F.R. 1003.101,102, ensuant from University of South Alabama Chairman's VIOLATION of medical risk adversity prohibition upon a PROTECTED federal disability instrument, alligning at U.S. Executive **INSUFFICIENCE** OF U.S. Court of Appeals Docket 97-3151 pleadings at the Appellee brief, in U.S. EXECUTIVE QUALIFICATION FOR ***SUBSTANTIVE DISCRETIONARY FUNCTIONAL IMMUNITY,*** explicitely LINKED from the U.S. Executive's SUGGESTION of Petitioner EVIDENCE DEARTH for claims at medical risk purpresture, asserted legally at U.S. N.D. Fla. Docket No. 3;97CV59/LAC.

At continuance of U.S. Executive **Oath**

at **functional obligation** to protect and to defend the U.S. Constitution, and owing therein that the U.S. *Executive was DISABLED to claim at* 11th Amendment Sovereign Privilege, any tangible legal forward of CLAIM AT SUBSTANTIVE DISCRETIONARY FUNCTIONAY IMMUNITY, the Petitioner respectfully FORWARDS the U.S. Executive's Oath at the U.S. Constitution, unto the sole jurisdiction at PETITIONER AVAIL in 28 U.S.C. 1251 access, to effect upon the U.S. Executive's responses, the substantive due process remedies apertures at mandamus AVAILED ORDER upon the U.S. Executive, to ASSENT DE NOVO for evidentiary rehearing upon federal disability instrument 260 72 6566, for **conservancy RESTORATIONS PRIMACY** upon the Petitioner's U.S. Citizenship in attainders by commomlaw Sovereigns ILLEGAL distributions covenants.

During the U.S. Executive's potential legal responses arguments to foreclose in perpetuity, the merit of evidentiary re-hearing upon the above cited federal disability instrument, the Petitioner respectfully requests the U.S. Executive's additional responses at general or specified CAUSATIONS, why the United State Attorney General should not assent to independent prosecutory investigations upon the U.S. Executive's ILLEGALLY CONSTRUCTED INTENT at **unconstitutional usage** of reserved federal code 20 C.F.R. 416.1465, before ONGOING commonlaw anti-trust violations by the Sovereign of

Colorado, as may convene to sufficience of U.S. N.D. Fla. evidence at Docket 3;97CV59/LAC, to suggest, during PERPETUIUTY OF U.S. EXECUTIVE ***DISSENT*** TO RE-HEAR FEDERAL INSTRUMENT 260 72 6566 IN CRITERIA OF DISABILITY, that the U.S. Executive AGENCY AT THE HHS SECRETARY'S ONUS, may have illegally constructed U.S. ANTI-TRUST COVENANT AT sub-agency LIABILITY WITH the Sovereign of Colorado, during supervening matter at anti-trust contracts legal remainders at N.D. Fla. legal pendency, therewith disrupting U.S. Sovereign's responsible dignity to uphold at Oath, the U.S. Constitution's tenents supporting the Petitioner's normal civil rights in particular co-subscription of U.S. Constitutional Amendment 14, **with Article IX.** of Executive E,95-2 Covenant on Human and Political Rights.

Hence at surrejoinder nisi SUBSCRIBED *with Supreme Court Rule ELEVEN*, subsequent to U.S. Legislature's JULY 15, 1998 ***IMMEDIATE NATIONAL INTERESTS*** in statutory review of articles convening U.S. Treasury disbursements protection at POTENTIAL physician medical risk malpractice at INDEMNITY FORECLOSURES, [Referred at 1997-1998 U.S. Senate Officers from Maine and Maryland, the Honorable Senators Collins and McKulski]

The Petitioner respectfully requests the United States Executive responses at petition for mandamus and prohibition conservancy for RE-HEARING upon federal disability convened at potential FRAUD, constructed at judicial FORBEARANCE to to hear at medical neuro-cardiology WHOLE BODY SYSTEMS disability, at evidence to NISI SURREJOINDER QUESTION ONE.

UNTO THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Petitioner respectfully requests the U.S. Attorney General's responses for interlocutory merit at the writs, at NISI GAIN for prosecutory review upon both the United States HHS Secretary and upon the Sovereign of Colorado, **initiating herewith** at Petition upon the United States Attorney General at 15 U.S.C. 4, for the institution of proceedings in equity relating at good cause to PREVENT the U.S. Executive's and the Sovereign of Colorado's statutory misusages shields at 20 C.F.R. 416.1465 and C.R.S. 24-10-109(1), to illegally sequester the tangible legal advent of 1994 Colorado Sovereign violation, at 15 U.S.C. 15 legal redress avail to an injured party at both U.S. Constitution and at U.S. Treaty, Executive E,95-2, in Article IX. and XVII. particularities.

The Petitioner acknowledges 28 U.S.C. 1251 as probable jurisdiction of final recourse, and thereafter additionally acknowledges that the FUNCTION of the United States Attorney General at U.S. Constitutional OATH, is to **ENFORCE the enacted laws of the United States** respecting the Branch Sovereign POWERS delegated by the U.S. Constitution.

Hence at U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL OBLIGATION to enforce U.S. statutes, the Petitioner respectfully requests the United States Attorney General's

EXPLICIT RESPONSES to show at good legal cause, why JOINT TORTFEASOR prosecution upon ANTI-TRUST CONSTR-UCTED CONTRACT at federal disability instrument 260-72 6566, should not establish CO-EQUITIES AND TENURED conventions at the evidentiary subject matter as might LEGALLY re-articulate upon a corrupted and non-protected federal instrument, IF AT **NATIONAL INTEREST** UNDER SUPREME COURT RULE 11, the United States Legislature has noticed medical fraud upon the United States Treasury in 1997 [Ref-erred from Senator Collins, R-Maine], and thereafter in 1998, has INITIATED STATUTORY DEBATE at medical indemnity COMPOSITES, to PROTECT U.S. Citizens from physician or **corporate** medical risk INDEMNITY FRAUD [Referred at P.B.S. Television broadcast upon the July 15, 1998 comments of Senator Mikulski, D.-Maryland].

III. THE LINEAR CITATIONS OF COURT RULINGS *EQUIVOCATIONS FOR LEGAL PREJUDICE*

A. Denver County Court Civil Division III, File No. 3P49019, at civil **contract breach** complaint for medical diagnostics/prognostics Sovereign refusals at DISPOSITION, THAT ON JULY 21, 1995: The informal NON-TRANSCRIBED SEGMENTAL RULING, suggested that the Petitioner was EXPLICITELY LIABLE to have reported " injury " to the Colorado Attorney General under C.R.S. 24-10-109(1)

B. U.S./Alabama Administrative Court, Ruling on October 25, 1995, that the Petitioner was deemed at 1970's

EMPLOYMENT HEBETUDE at qualification for federal disability instrument 260 72 6566.

C. U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado Civil Action No. 96-D-2506, Ruling **with legal prejudice** on May 20, 1997, during U.S.P.S. delivery ***fraud***, that the Petitioner's U.S. Constitutional ENTITY COMPLAINT was constructed at REQUISITE to nominate particular Colorado Sovereign medical licenses at the defendancy of federal entity question.

D. U.S. N.D. Fla. at Civil Action No. 3:97CV59/LAC, ruling of July 14, 1997,**absent to legal prejudice**, that the Petitioner's legal claims at F.R.C.P. Rule 8(a) were redundantly insufficient at brevity, and thereafter DENYING Petitioner MOTIONS RELIEF, at particular evidence in medical risk purpresture perpetuity.

E. U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit, ABSTAINING to JURISDICTIONAL FORWARD MOTION under Supreme Court Rule 19 Certificate, and **assenting** to Dismissal motion **at legal prejudice** WITHOUT U.S.C. requital qualifications or stipulations, AND ENTERED ON MAY 8, 1998.

IV. JURISDICTION RESTS AT **RESERVED LEAVE OR ASSENT** AT CONCISE LEGAL INTERLUDES FROM 28 U.S.C. 1331 UNTO 28 U.S.C. 1251

A. The Order of Dismissal sought at review was entered on July 14, 1997 at U.S. N.D. Fla. The Petitioner subscribes SUPREME

COURT RULE 11 legal U.S.C. AMPLIFICATIONS to both mandamus and prohibition, during ONGOING U.S. Legislature's NATIONAL PUBLIC INTEREST profiles at medical risk indemnity at STATUTORY REVISIONS PROSPECTUS, and at health-care provider FRAUD at EXTENSIVE LIABILITY upon the U.S. Treasury.

B. No Petition for U.S.C.A. 11th Circuit re-hearing was undertaken during U.S.C. dismissal stipulation FORFEIT.

C. Cross-Petition is non-exanct.

D. **15 U.S.C. 4** is believed to adaquately confer jurisdictional AMPLIFICATION upon 28 U.S.C. 1331 and 28 U.S.C. 1346 at U.S. N.D. Fla. during legal pendencies therein RESTING FROM U.S. COLORADO DISTRICT AT SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS INTERRUPTION BY U.S.P.S. FRAUD.

E. Supreme Court Rule 29.4(c) pre-notification by Affidavit, did occur as Petitioner-signed to the Clerk at Fair inclusions affidavit APPENDED. **NOTIFICATION to Colorado Attorney on July 22, 1998 did occur referred to usage unconstitutionality of C.R.S. 24-10-109(1).**

V. THE **VERBATUM** AUTHORITIES BELIEVED TO ESTABLISH THE GOVERNING LEGAL PRINCIPLES FOR LEGAL GAIN AT CONSENT FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRITS AT MANDAMUS AND AT PROHIBITION TO U.S. DISTRICT REMAND

A. U.S. Constitutional Article of Amendment 14 Section 1. wherein: All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are

citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdictions equal protection of the laws.
[Please see citations arguments unto medical risk purprestures at the Appellant's Primary Brief at U.S.C.A. Docket No. 97-3151, pages 42-47, particularly referred at Washington v. Glucksberg, 117 S.Ct. 2258 at RIGHTS OF DISABILITY, and thereafter on page 18 of the Appellant Brief, at Jennings v. Davis 476 F.2d. 1271, at FEDERAL PRIMACY before state law.]

B. Articles IX and XVII. at the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Executive E, 95-2 wherein at ARTICLE IX:
1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subject to **ARBITRARY** arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedures as are established by law.
[Please see 20 C.F.R. 416.1465 as reserved federal code authority, at non-avail to review]

ARTICLE XVII:
1. No one shall be subjected to ARBITRARY or UNLAWFUL interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to **unlawful attacks on his honor or reputation.**
2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the laws against such interference or attacks. [Please see pages 102-103 of U.S. March 14, 1997 U.S. Executive certification before U.S. N.D. Fla. File 3:97CV59/LAC, wherewith the Petitioner's **PROPERTY OF D.V.M. Degree and Licenses** were attacked by U.S. Judicial authority ***without proper evidence***, and thereafter were remanded by the same U.S. Judicial authority, at RFC (Reserved Federal Code) prospectus, during non-qualification for federal disability written admission.]

C. U.S. Constitutional Article IV. Section 2 wherewith:
The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of citizens in the several states.
[Please see U.S. Constitution equity attainder authority at Barton v. Barbour, 26 L.Ed. 672, at Petitioner/Appellant Primary Brief to U.S.C.A. 11th Circuit, pages 21.22, extending to United States v. Oregon Medical Society 72 S.Ct. 690.]

D. U.S. Constitutional Article of Amendment **IX.**, wherewith:
The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall

not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.
[Please see EMINENT DOMAIN AUTHORITY ARGUMENT AT MARBURY V. MADISON DIST. COL. 1803, 5 U.S. 137, at pages 14-15 of Petitioner/Appellant Primary Brief to U.S.C.A. 11th Circuit]

E. 20 C.F.R. 416.1465 which is { RESERVED] at **non-avail to publishment before the U.S, Supreme Court**

F. 42 C.F.R. 1003.101 [at Sovereign of Alabama violation in medical risk purpresture before federal instrument of disability 260 72 6566] wherein:
For purposes of this part, **ADVERSE AFFECT** means medical care has not been provided and the failure to provide such necessary medical care has presented an imminent danger to the health, safety, or well-being of the patient, or has placed the patient unnecessarily in a high risk situation.

G. 42 C.F.R. 1003.102 [referred to Office of Inspector General imposition of penalties and assessments upon individual violations at federal instruments wherein at page 978 at individual deportment:
MISREPRESENTS an individual's condition or other information including a hospital's **OBLIGATION**

under this section (2) for purposes under this section, a responsible physician or hospital " knowingly " violates Section 1867 of the Act, if the responsible physician or hospital reckless disregards or **deliberately ignors material fact.**

H. COLORADO REVISED STATUTE, C.R.S. 24-10-1009(1), applied by the Sovereign of Colorado during U.S. Executive legal interests at disability claim 260 72 6566] wherein:

NOTICE REQUIRED-contents-to whom given-limitations. (1) Any person claiming to have suffered an injury by a public entity or by an employee thereof while in the course of such employment, whether or not by a willful or wanton act or omission, shall file a written notice as provided in this section within one hundred eighty days after the discovery of the injury, regardless of whether the person then knew all the elements of a claim or of a cause of action for such injury. **Compliance** with this section shall be a jurisdictional prerequisite to any action brought under the provisions of this article, and **failure of compliance shall forever bar any such action.**

[Please see U.S.C.A. Petitioner/ Appellant Authorities at SUBJECT MATTER DIVISIONS AT FORESEEABILITY, pages 19 and 20 at Jennings v. Davis, 476 F.2d. 1271 and at Bigbee v. Pacific Telephone, 34 Cal. 3d. 49.]

I. **15 U.S.C. 4:** at anti-trust legal pendencies before U.S. Executive legal interest at federal disability INTERSTATE Colorado Sovereign contract activity, wherein:
4: Jurisdiction of courts; duty of United States Attorneys; PROCEDURE:
The several ***district*** courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of sections 1 to 7 of this title; and it shall be the duty of the several United States attorneys, in their respective districts, under the *direction of the Attorney General*, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. Such proceedings may be by way of PETITION, setting forth the case and praying that such violation be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of shall have been duely notified of such PETITION, the court shall proceed, as soon as may be, to the hearing and determination of the case; and pending such petition and before final decree, the court may at any time, make such temporary restraining order as shall be deemed just in the premises.
[Please see U.S. Executive **CONSTITUTIONAL RECEIVERSHIP** CONSENT BY U.S. N.D. FLA. at federal disability July

14, 1997 Dismissal before F.R.C.P. Rule 8(a), during Petitioner **overrule authority** citation at Vakaria v. Little Co. Mary Hospital, 917 F. Supp. 1282, at U.S.C.A. 11th Circuit APPELLANT REPLY BRIEF, pages 8-9]

J. U.S. CONSTITUTION at Article I. Section 10, applied to this Petition for extraordinary writs at Sovereign Colorado and U.S. Executive ***JOINT TORTFEASOR*** liability before UNCONSTITUTIONAL statutory applications to federal disability instrument ACTUARY of medical risk purpresture, during U.S. Executive FUNCTIONAL DISCRETIONARY FOREKNOWLEDGE of **INTERSTATE** CIVIL CONTRACTUAL DISPUTE at 1995 Claim 260 72 6566 wherein: ***No State shall*** enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, ***or Law impairing Obligation of Contracts***, or grant any Title of Nobility.

IV. THE CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE AT 11TH CIRCUIT JURISDICTIONAL DISSENT AT 28 U.S.C. 1291 **CONVERSION** UPON LEGAL NON-PREJUDICE APPELLATE FORWARD FROM U.S. N.D. FLA. **10TH CIRCUIT** LEGAL PENDENCIES

A. The Eleventh Circuit U.S.C.A. **conversion** of legal non-prejudice, remands at questions to the merits for proper mandamus and prohibit-

ion upon U.S. N.D. Fla. Dismissal, at **particularity discernment** that U.S.C.A. 11th Circuit VAGARY to hear at **substantive medical controlling EFFECT**, may exist QUESTIONABLY APPLICABLE FOR LEGAL SEQUESTRATIONS review by A SINGLE Justice's Rule 23 sanction for STAY OF U.S. COURT OF APPEALS DISMISSAL, owing that 11th Circuit appellate court **did explicitely FORFEIT** U.S.C. stipulations for merit upon the May 8, 1998 dismissal, therein ESTABLISHING ***EQUIVOCATIONS*** AT THE MERITS of U.S. 10th Circuit legal pendency conduits FOR legal **NON-PREJUDICED DISMISSAL REMAINDERS** within the U.S. N.D. Fla. July 14, 1997 ***ELEVENTH*** CIRCUIT ORDER OF DISMISSAL AND HENCE,

B. The questions to the merits for both extraordinary writs in mandamus and in prohibition, exert **DUALITY** merit prospectus at NISI and at NISI SURREJOINDER upon the respondents, wherein the PRIMACY at U.S. Constitutional and Treaty Rights attainders redress at U.S. Petitioner citizenship, is addressed ***first*** upon the Supreme Court's consent to Order the U.S. Executive to RE-HEAR the evidence at legally **offended federal disability**, and is thereafter constructed at subsequent legal merit INFRASTRUCTURE TO COMMONLAW VIOLATIONS ANTITRUST SUBDIDIARY, UPON THE **plenary legal reserve** at the SUPREME COURT'S BAR, to exert DISCERNMENTS UPON THOSE ILLEGAL *COMMONLAW* OFFENSES AT 15 U.S.C. 4, during

U.S Sovereign and Colorado Sovereign UNCONSTITUTIONAL MISUSAGES of 20 C.F.R. 416.1465 and C.R.S. 24-10-109(1), AT TORTIOUS CONTRACT IN VERTICLE INTERSTATE MONOPOLY upon federal disability.

V. THE PETITIONER ARGUMENT **AMPLIFYING** AT DISCRETIONAL FUNCTIONAL IMMUNITY RESERVE, THE QUALIFICATION FOR RETENTION OF THE WRITS AT MANDAMUS AND PROBITION

Initiating at U.S. Supreme Court Rule 11, at contemporary ***U.S. Senate*** concern for legislative statutory protection to the U.S. Electorate and upon the U.S. Treasury's collateral vulnerabilities at sanction in **non-protected** or continuing medical indemnity fraud [Referred to U.S. Senate Officers **Collins** from Maine and **Mikulski** from Maryland],

The Petitioner respectfully envokes Supreme Court Rule **10(a)** at 11th Circuit U.S. **DISTRICT AND APPELLATE** extraordinary legal departures for jurisdictional NON-SANCTION or forward for appropriate JUDICIAL MOULDINGS, upon the outstanding federal questions, **reliant** at the particularities in MEDICAL PURPRESTURE **evidentiary RISK**, ongoing before federal disability instrument 260-72 6566 WITHIN the U.S. District Court for the District of Northern Florida **F.R.C.P. RULE 9(A) forfeit.**

Hereafter at legal amplitudes authorities upon U.S. N.D. Fla. July 14, 1997 Dismissal at Petitioned Review, during U.S.C.A. 11th circuit

dearth of U.S.C. stipulations unto its May 8, 1998 dismissal, the Petitioner **SUGGESTS that the U.S. Executive has FAILED in the lower courts**, to set forth appreciating legal margins at the March 10, 1998 Appellee Brief, pleading at 28 U.S.C. 1346 construction of discretional functional immunity, when at 28 U.S.C. 1346(b), the ***U.S. Executive has FAILED*** to demonstrate the exercise of ***DUE CARE*** during the HHS Secrerary's ONUS [at SSA COMMISSIONER FORWARD OF MEDICAL RISK ACTUARY TO HHS OIG ON OCTOBER 24, 1996] ***FOR LIKE DUE CARE*** at the partitioned legal premises in 28 U.S.C. 1346(b), wherein:

> " The provisions of this chapter and section 1346(b) of this title shall not apply to-
> " (a) Any claim based upon an act or omission of an employee of the government, **EXERCISING DUE CARE**, in the execution of a statute or regulation, whether or not such statute or regulation be valid, or based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused . "
> [Please see APPENDIX at **INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONTROLLING EFFECT**]

WHEREFORE: The Petitioner cites at authority analog at Downs v. United States, 522 F.2d. 990 (6th Circuit 1975), that U.S. Executive discretionary functional immunity at the **tri-partite** divisions in ***responsible constructive medical knowledge*** impelled WITHIN the **COMPOSITE ONUS** of the HHS Secretary, the HHS Inspector General, and SSA Commissioner, would thereafter remand to discretional functional ***immunities CECESSATION***, proposed at Dalehite v. United States **346 U.S. 15** (1953) at 4-3 majority, wherein immunized discretion **only:**

> " includes determinations made by executives or administrators in establishing plans, specifications, or schedules of operations . "

WHEREAFTER: in the ***ABSENCE*** of U.S. Legislative STATUTORY CONSENTS AT ARBITRATIVE CRITERIA for hearing, during the advent of medical risk indemnities forfeit or civil purpresture ligands to such indemnity forfeit, the United States Judiciary should stand at JURISDICTIONAL ***SOLITARY OBLIGATION***, to hear at the ***evidenced*** appropriety of the subject matter LEGAL GAIN for medical risk, **posited rationally**, that at Dalehite v. United States, 346 U.S. 15 (1953), the APPLICATION of composite C.F.R. Rules governing medical disability **amplifications** at risk, does ***not*** appear as a PRE-TENURED ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGATION at POLICY DISCERNMENTS IMMUNITY UNTO U.S. LEGISLATIVE **PROTECTIVE** INTENTS at 42 C.F.R. 1003.-

101,102, SUCCINCTLY at Dalehite v. United States, 346 U.S. 15, 35-36, that the 1953 U.S. Supreme Court did **not**, and ***could not have envisiond*** *ANY U.S. Sovereign medical caste* **ethos** precipitation at BIOETHICAL mutation reserves at **NON-UNIVERSAL** STATUTORY DEMAND FOR PROTECTED EXTRAORDINARY INDEMNITY AT U.S. Senate NOTATION, and thence also convened in 1997 before the U.S. Supreme Court's 1997 unanimous **DISSENTS to amend** State statutory terminal illness **disability protection** from CHEMICALLY ASSISTED euthanasia, during medical caste non-universal demands at VASCO V. QUILL, 117 S. Ct. 2293 and WASHINGTON V. GLUCKSBERG, 117 S.Ct. 2258.

Hence, the Petitioner prays The U.S. Supreme Court's grant at merit, during requisites of U.S. District jurisdictional remand at U.S. Constitution and U.S. Treaty **EQUITIES OF OBLIGATION**, the extraordinary writs at mandamus and at prohibition, suggesting that U.S. Executive non-fulfillment of DUE CARE at the October 25, 1995 grant of partial medical favor to federal disability, DOES DISQUALIFY the U.S. Executive for 28 U.S.C. 1346(B) discretionary immunity, and therein AT CONSEQUENCE, qualifies both RE-HEARING OF FEDERAL DISABILITY at mandamus for evidentiary resolution, and for apertures in **prosecutory** discernments avail *upon both* the U.S. Executive and the Sovereign of Colorado, during the **convention of interstate contract monopolies upon**

the federal disability instrument, thereafter ADDITIONALLY DENIED 1996 U.S. Executive protection from medical risk adversity imposed by the Sovereign of Alabama at 42 C.F.R. 1003.101,102 prohibition.

AT APPOSITION TO THE UNITED STATES JUDICIARY DURING MEDICAL RISK PURPRESTURE AT U.S. CONSTITUTION AND TREATY:

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 did provide for the U.S. Judiciary's **onus**, in lieu of private bills of relief before the U.S. Legislature, to examine the rights of tort victims under United States Code and equity of circumstances.

VI. Under Supreme Court Rule 9(a), **Counsel of Record**, appearing on this Petition's cover page, certifies that he is not an attorney by academic degree, and is therefor ineligible to apply for Supreme Court Bar Membership under PROPRIETARY ETHICS subscribed by Part Two of the Supreme Court's Rules; however, Counsel of Record, being ADMITTED to all rights and privileges at the professional degree of Doctor in Veterinary Medicine at the University of Georgia, does assert at solemn affirmation to comply with the Rules of United State Supreme Court at personal conduct onus to support the United States Constitution before this Bar's **international universality** of ethical pre-requisites bestowed at these Rules.

Therefor, Counsel in Pro Se herewith

asserts upon this Petition for Extraordinary Writs at Mandamus and at Prohibition, to have COMPLIED with Supreme Court Rule 20, at the Court's directive to format within Supreme Court Rule 14, wherein at Rule 14.4, the ELEMENTS of subject matter REQUISITES to **attain linguistic accuracy** and general comprehensibility, may have marginally PRESUMED forfeit at brevity, at mandate for CONCISION TO THE LEGAL QUESTION.

Inasmuch as the lower courts have contrived in writing to have **AFFIRMED** the linguistic clairity of Counsel's pleadings in the U.S. District of Colorado, and thereafter have **DISSENTED** upon the general tenured " intelligibility " of *Counsel's English language* usage within the U.S. District of Northern Florida, Counsel at Petition herewith PRAYS that the Court **shall find** linguistic interpretive **meter** at appropriate equity upon this Petition's ENDEAVOR to partition at authorities, unto U.S. Constitution and U.S. Treaty of Law, at ADVENTS in resolutions-binding at bioethical medical risk subject matter evidence outstanding, explicitely therein, *DETAINING* the Petitioner's rights as **ARE DUE RESTORED** AT CONSTITUTION AND TREATY **EQUITIES relief**, having been besought in the lower courts, and restrained at particular F.R.C.P. Rule 9(a) discovery forfeits at process.

VII. The Petitioner declares **no CORPORATE**

subsidiary legal interest attached to the Legal Interests of the Petitioner Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M., herewith.

VIII. FROM THE PETITION'S TITLE IV., the RELIEF SOUGHT AT NON-AVAIL IN ANY OTHER COURT, is that of 28 U.S.C. 1251 jurisdictional reserved assent to review the U.S.C. FORFEIT AMPLITUDES of 10th and 11th DISTRICTS EQUIVOCATIONS at prejudice *MARGINS*, sustaining U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL ATTAINDERS upon the Petitioner, at solitary aperture for MERIT OF AVAILED RELIEF, **by remand to U.S. DISTRICT 28 U.S.C. 1331 AND 1346 JURISDICTIONS AT U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AND TREATY QUESTIONS**, during common-law violations retained to U.S. N.D. FLA. DISMISSAL ***AT NON-PREJUDICE***, and thence DUE AT EQUITY to evidentiary PROCUREMENTS at ongoing MEDICAL RISK PURPRESTURES PERPETUITY RELIEF at particular good cause.

IX. Under U.S. Supreme Court Closure Rule 34.3, the Petitioner AFFIRMS **SIGNATORY SURETY on July 22, 1998** upon this PETITION AT RULE 20 to jurisdictional RESERVE AT 28 U.S.C. 1251, at Wyoming Notary Bond by Mrs. Ellen Harnden, whose Commission expires on April 7, 2000.

Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084
[TEMPORARY ADDRESS OF RECORD]
Telephone 850-492-0315

THE ERRATA AT U.S. SUPREME COURT DOCKET FIRST PUBLISHMENT AT ALL RIGHTS RESERVED BY JEAN FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA

I. The foregoing declared ERRATA to the Docket Publishment, are acknowledged subsequent to the Petitioner's July 24, 1998 conversation with Clerk Lorson, at UNCERTAINLY of Mr. Justice Kennedy's potential grant of time enlargments extending the August 6, 1998 DUE DATE of this Petition, during the Petitioner's additional declaration to Mr. Lorson, that computor hardware difficulty had initiated to <u>extreme press</u> upon the Petitioner, during marginal health difficulties.

A. At page vi., SP. EQUITY
B. At page 5, SP. Senator Mikulski
C. After TITLE V., beginning at page 7, the consecutive TITLES are MISNUMBERED beginning on page 10

THE APPENDIX TO THE PETITION FOR THE EXTRAORDINARY WRITS

I. The Orders and Opinions issued in conjunctive regard unto the judgment sought to be reviewed:

A. July 21, 1995, Denver County Court Civil Division THREE, at **ORAL SEGMENTAL JUDICIAL ASSUMPTION** from the Honorable James B. Breese, Civil File 3P49019, that the Petitioner had been **INJURED** under C.R.S. 24-10-109(1) LEGAL OBLIGATION to have reported injury to the Colorado Attorney General,

B. The April 28, 1997 U.S. Magistrate Judge's PARTIAL FINDINGS at U.S. Constitutional question, at U.S. District of Colorado Civil Action No. 96-D-2506:

> " On January 3, 1997, I ordered plaintiff to provide a More Definate Statement. He was to set forth the federal law upon which he based his claim and facts supporting the claim. Mr. Lauslega responded on or about January 13, 1997 stating his claims were as follows: " Citizenship Rights and Article IV. Sections 1 and 2; **Amendment Article IX**. and Amendment Article XIV. Section 1. Plaintiff subscribes Legal Profoundment before 42 C.F.R. 1003.101." Mr. Lauslega provides a synopsis of events which are at least in a logical order. On May 14, 1994 he wrote the University

of Colorado Faculty of Medicine requesting a baro-reflex observation and analysis. He was apparently seen on September 28, 1994 at the Neurology Department and then referred to Psychiatry. On January 30, 1995 he called Dr. Pollak at the C.U. Science Center and expressed that he felt the neurological workup had been incomplete. On March 18, 1995 he reviewed his medical record and concluded that he had not been baro-reflex tested on September 28, 1994.

He brought a lawsuit in April 1995 against the University of Colorado Faculty in the State District Court of Denver Colorado. His case was denied in July 1995. **The plaintiff then filed " validated " claims with the Attorney General of Colorado.**

C. FILED U.S.C.A. ORDER OF MAY 8, 1998 DISMISSAL [submitted hereinafter verbatum]:

IN THE UNTED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT; No. 97-3151; JEAN FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA, Plaintiff-Appellant, versus THE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE AS COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY; DEPARTMENT OF HHS; ET AL., Defendants-Appellees, On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida; BEFORE: HATCHETT, Chief Judge, BARKETT and MARCUS, Circuit Judges. BY THE COURT: Appellees' motions to dismiss this appeal " for want

of prosecution " **construed as** motions to dismiss this appeal as frivolous, are GRANTED. Appellees' motions for attorney's fees and **costs are DENIED.**

CERTIFIED FILING U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT, MAY 8, 1998, THOMAS K. KAHN, CLERK upon the Clerk's May 8, 1998 Signature, ABSENT JUDICIAL SIGNATURES.
[N.B.: Dismissal was re-certified by Clerk Kahn at the Motion of the Petitioner as was denied:]

II. The additional RELEVANT OPINIONS and COURT ORDER, suggesting legal profoundments ligatures at subject matter due process failures at U.S. Constitutional ***NINTH AMENDMENT ATTAINDER*** UPON THE PETITIONER, at medical risk MONOPOLISTIC NON-IMMUNITY to the Colorado Sovereign medical referral **RECEIVER AGENT at Instrument 260 72 6566**, thus WELL-ALLIGNED ABOVE at April 28, 1997 U.S. Magistrate findings.

A. PARTIAL VERBATUM TRANSCRIPTION UPON COLORADO DENVER COUNTY JUDGE JAMES B. BREESE'S LEGAL PURVIEWS OF UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO SOVEREIGN ACTIVITY AT CIVIL VENUE P349010, ABSENT TO PETITIONER MONETARY CLAIMS, AND REFERRED HEREWITH **CONFIRMATORY** UPON THE FINDINGS OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE D.E. ABRAM ON APRIL 28, 1997:

TRANSCRIPTION JULY 21, 1995
PAGE 2, LINES 10-24:

But basically, its some kind of--**the Court understanding** is some kind of combination of a neurological and cardiological kind of interaction and reaction, which perhaps would have some **health implications**. And my understanding is that Mr. Lauslega has gone to the University of Colorado to receive treatment, had some expectation and hope that they would treat him, and now more specifically **and MOST specifically**, was asking for something called a barro-receptor analysis test. And, what the Court's understanding of it is, is that it's Mr. Lauslega's understanding or belief, that there is a way of investigating these kinds of responses that he wants the doctors to do at the Neurology Clinic. And apparently, ***they do not want to do such a test.***

TRANSCRIPTION JULY 12, 1995
PAGE 14, LINES 7-12:

THE COURT: Yeah. Board of Medical Examiners. But, but I think, but I think there is merit to the position of, is this sort of a judicible issue, is this a case, is this the kind of matter that the Court should be involved in? I think that's a legitimate issue.

TRANSCRIPTION JULY 12, 1995
PAGE 19, LINES 3-17:

THE COURT: **What contract do you have**?
MR. LAUSLEGA: I wrote a letter to--to the University, I was answered by the University representative, Barb-Calhoun.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. LAUSLEGA: Suggesting that the University would be willing to service this complaint. There was a period of several months between my initiation and the answer. As I recall, I wrote them sometime in May of 1994: I was answered in August of 1994. That would be the contract breach as the basis for the, for the claim of medical services. Now as I recall,--
THE COURT: So you're--you'e saying that there's some agree-ment by the University that they would treat you?
MR. LAUSLEGA: **I have deposit**, not treatment.

B. THE VERBATUM ORDER OF N.D. FLORIDA U.S. COURT, **DENYING** ON JULY 25, 1997, PLAINTIFF MOTION AT **SUBJECT MATTER IN BARO-REFLEX PROOF OF MEDICAL CONCERN** OR ATTRIBUTION AT MEDICAL RISK:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

JEAN FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA VS. U.S. EXECUTIVE ET AL., CASE NO. 3:97-cv59/LAC
REFERRAL AND ORDER
Referred to Judge Lacey Collier

on July 25, 1997.
MOTIONS/PLEADINGS: MOTION FOR PARTIAL FINDINGS IN **BARORECEPTOR REFLEX ADMISSIONS** OF 1970 MEDICAL CONCERN IN GENERAL ANESTHESIOLOGY AND EXTENT OF 1970 MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE FROM SOCIETY OF ANESTHESIOLOGY JOURNAL IN GERRARD GEBBER, PH.D. *BE ADMITTED* TO THIS COURT AND MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL.
Filed by Plaintiff on 7/24/97
Doc. # 68 &69
LC 1 0r 2: 1. By Deputy Clerk Teresa Cole.
ORDER
Upon consideration of the foregoing it is ORDERED this 25 day of July, 1997 that: **the relief requested is DENIED.**
Lacey A. Collier, United States District Judge
ENTERED ON DOCKET 7/28/97 by TC
(Rule 58 and 79(A) FRCP or 32(b)(1) & 55 FRCRP)
Copies mailed to Lauslega, Blondeau, Lassiter, McCranie, Document 77, CERTIFIED AT STAMP, Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Ct. Northern Dist. Fla.,Pensacola, Fla., 97 July 28, AM 8:21, FILED

III. **THE VERBATUM JUDGMENT SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

JEAN FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA, D.V.M., Plaintiff, v. The United States Executive (PARTITIONED IN COMPLAINT) IN: THE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, THE SECRETARY [COMMISSIONER]

OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, THE LAWFIRM OF PRIVATE ENTITY IN B.A. LASSITER, ESQ., & THE CHAIRMAN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ANETHESIOLOGY IN JOHN N. MILLER, M.D., Defendants.

Case No: 3:97cv59/LAC

ORDER

On April 22, 1997, this Court dismissed Plaintiff's complaint for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a).(9 doc 30). The Court found that the complaint consisted entirely of rambling, unintelligible statements which were impossible to deceipher, and Plaintiff was granted 45 days to amend. Plaintiff, who is proceeding in pro se, was advised to seek the assistance of counsel if he doubted his ability to comply with Rule 8(a). On June 5, 1997, apparently without securing counsel, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint. (doc 36).

Before the Court are Defendants' motions to dismiss the amended complaint. (doc 44, 47-48). Plaintiff has responded to all but the motion filed by Booker and Lassiter, P.C. [footnote one] (doc. 50). **Only** Booker and Lassiter has raised inability to comprehend the amended complaint as grounds for dismissal. Because the Court agrees with Booker and Lassiter that the **amended complaint is just as unintelligible** as the orig-

ional one, its motion to dismiss is GRANTED. The other Defendants' motions are also GRANTED on this independent basis [footnote two].

Accordingly it is hereby ORDERED:

1. Defendants' motions to dismiss (doc. 44, 47-48) are GRANTED as set forth herein. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice, subject to the folllowing conditions: (1) Plaintiff may only file a second amended complaint if he is represented by an attorney; and (2) if Plaintiff fails to amend the complaint within ninety (90) days from the date of this Order, this action shall be forever barred.

Ordered this 14th day of July, 1997.
Lacey A. Collier, United States District Judge

FOOTNOTE ONE: On July 10, 1997, Plaintiff filed a petition for the dismissal of Byron A. Lassiter, Esq. (doc 51). It is unclear whether Plaintiff seeks the dismissal of Mr. Lassiter's law firm.
FOONOTE TWO: The Court finds the amended complaint especially confusing given **the appearance** in the record that the Plaintiff is suing Defendants over their participation in an award of social security disability benefits to the Plaintiff.
7/15/97 TC
COPIES TO LAUSLEGA, BLONDEAU, LASSITER ADN MCCRANIE
STAMPED: OFFICE OF THE CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT CT. NORTHERN DIST. FLA. PENSACOLA, FLA. 97 JUL 15 AM 7:39

IV. THE PETITIONER AFFIDAVITS, PROCUREMENTS, REQUISITIONS AND STATEMENTS BEFORE PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRITS ATTACHED HEREAFTER

A. THE AFFIDAVIT AT LEGAL SUBSIDIARY INTERNATONAL MEDICAL CONTROLLING EFFECT

B. THE MEDICAL STANDARDS PROCUREMENT REQUEST UPON MAYO FACULTY OF MEDICINE

C. THE JUNE 19, 1998 FAIR INCLUSIONS AFFIDAVIT BEFORE THE SOVEREIGN OF COLORADO ATTORNEY GENERAL, DENVER DISTRICT COURT, AND U.S. DISTRICT CLERK FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

D. THE JUNE 18, 1998 DECLARATIONS UNTO U.S. DISTRICT OF COLORADO CLERK EHRLICH

E. THE JUNE 17, 1998 REQUEST UPON DENVER COUNTY COURT AT TRANSCRIPTION ERROR [FAILED AT MRS. ELLERBEE'S CONSENT TO RESPOND AS OF JULY 15, 1998]

F. THE JUNE 24, 1998 AFFIDAVIT UNTO U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL PROXY VERNA N. MUCKLE

G. THE AFFIDAVIT OF LEGAL DISCLAIMER IN PETITIONER FOREKNOWLEDGE OF **LIASON BETWEEN THE LAWFIRM OF BOOKER AND LASSITER AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA PROFESSOR IN NEUROLOGY NOWACK**

H. THE CERTFICATION OF PETITIONER FAMILIAL LINEAGE FROM THE 6TH U.S. CENSUS

I. THE JULY 6, 1998 AFFIDAVIT UNTO UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO COUNSEL

J. THE JULY 6, 1998 AFFIDAVIT UNTO U.S.P.S. GENERAL COUNSEL

THE AFFIDAVIT IN SUBSTANTIAL GROUNDS FOR **INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONTROLLING EFFECT** AT SUPREME COURT PETITION FOR THE WRITS AT JEAN FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA, D.V.M. VERSUS THE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE ET AL., OCTOBER 1997 TERM

The Undersigned on July 23, 1998, submits Affidavit to Petition Appendix at the Writs for Mandamus and for Prohibition, and avers the foregoing:

1. At the ongoing EVIDENCE to medical risk explicitely conveyed to fraudulently CONVENED federal instrument 260 72 6566, international expert in neuro-cardiology, Michele Brignole, M.D., has testified upon the existent medical risk in general anesthesiology before TWO United States District Courts, and upon U.S.C.A. 11th Circuit distribution, Dr. Brignole did MEDICALLY REFER the Petitioner at 11th Cir. R. 28.2(b), to FOUR U.S. physicians for autonomic physical examination.
2. During the TENURE of Dr. Brignole's medical referral at ECCA Docket 97-3151, NONE of the four U.S. physicians receiving Dr. Brignole's legitimate medical referral have indicated any particular WILLINGNESS to examine the Petitioner in heart-period variability or baro-reflex.
3. The Undersigned avers at OPINION, that the advent of MANDAMUS upon the U.S. Executive MIGHT DETER additional physician restraint to examine the Petitioner in autonomic medicine at LEGITIMATE medical conferrals with anesthesiology's confirmation of HIGH MEDICAL RISK to the Petitioner.

4. Inasmuch as Dr. Brignole's EXPLICIT FOREKNOWLEDGE OF MEDICAL RISK SPECIFICITY INITIATION, is founded AT UNITED STATES PHYSICIANS' HISTORICALLY ESTABLISHED STANDARDS within the Mayo Faculty of Medicine at J.E. Thomas [1969] and at J.D. Michenfelder [1986], the **controlling legal subsidiary at 28 U.S.C. 1346(b) in U.S. Executive NON-QUALIFICATION for discretional *functional immunity at DEARTH OF DUE CARE,*** would appear as a JUDICIALLY MOULDED INTERPRETION at linguists formulation WITHIN 28 U.S.C. 1346(b), wherein DOUBLE INDEMNITY **for** the U.S. Sovereign, appears at the linguistic judicial discretion to perceive that " DUE CARE " is apparently MARGINALLY DISCARDED wherefor: U.S. AGENCY " abuse " at discretion, remains vouchsafe at the statutory **EXCEPTION** to such indemnity at functional administratve deportment norms.
5. At LONG-TERM physician restraint to examine the Petitioner at med-risk indemnity, the Undersigned avers that in 1994,that physical EXAMINATION AT LEVEL IV. was refused to the Affiant at margins to United States County Sheriff at legal threat retained to Sheriff NON-ASSENT to consider any prosecution upon the Affiant.

Signed on July 23, 1998 before
STATE OF WYOMING NOTARY:
J. Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.

THE JUNE 24, 1998 MEDICAL STANDARDS PROXY RESERVES REQUEST BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIARY, FOR GENERAL STIPULATIONS PHYSICIAN CONFIRMATION OR DISSENTS FOR AT RISK SPECIFICITIES IN CHEMICAL ANESTHESIOLOGY UPON ACETYLCHOLENE BRAIN NEURONS DURING MEDICAL SUGGESTION OF BARO-REFLEX PARALYSIS AT THE BRAIN STEM OR AT THE ROSTRAL BRAIN

REMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO MAY 26, 1998 LEGAL CIRCUMSTANCES AFFIDAVIT TO THE GENERAL FACULTY OF MEDICINE AND DIRECTED BEFORE:

John D. Michenfelder, M.D.,
Professor of Anesthesiology
c/o Stephen Hammill, M.D.
Division of Cardiology
Mayo Faculty of Medicine
232 Plummer Street
Rochester, Mn. 55905

ETHICAL APPOSITION JUSTIFYING PROXY REQUEST:

Dear Doctor Michenfelder:

In the final chapter of your medical textbook, ANESTHESIA AND THE BRAIN, your ethical suggestion to your colleagues at informational NETWORKING of medical knowledge, suggested the benefit of ADHERENCE TO TRUTH, BEYOND PHYSICIAN EGO REQUISITES, in that on occasion in the press of modern times, the individual physician is often tempted to suppress information critical to the individual privilege of human life under the

On the occasionof this request for medical standards proxy reserves before the United States Judiciary, I propose unto your medical license and medical expertise in general anesthesiology, at your PROFESSIONAL ABILITY TO CORRECT any general misinterpretive error at my own professional interpretations as a D.V.M. colleague, the foregoing general PRESUMPTIONS at medical standards risk in general anesthesiology, during any suggestion or medical presentment in baro-reflex brain stem paralysis of acetylcholene neural functional abnormality:

1. It is my general understanding that certain brain ENZYMES do regulate the usage of oxygen at the brain, that the maintenance of adequate oxygen flow to brain tissue during general anesthesiology is the PRIMARY medical concern preventing medical risk in general anesthesiology, and that the MECHANISM of physician ability to ASSURE adequate oxygen to the anesthetized brain, is effected THROUGH blood pressure maintenance in the brain, during general anesthesilogy.
2. It is my general understanding from your textbook, ANESTHESIA AND THE BRAIN, that regional brain pathology suggesting pre-standing INADEQUATE oxygen metabolism [or delivery] to specific brain areas, exists at ~~medical risk physician pre-concern~~ for the reason that these areas of pathology are pre-disposed medically, during anesthesis, to ACCUMULATE FLUIDS, if the physician is UNABLE to maintain adequate brain blood pressure during anesthesia, and that

the medical concern at fluid accumulations in the brain is that PRESSURE on these regional brain tissues, formats a gauntlet of ENLARGEMENTS of such pathology, at some point thereafter, formatting IRREVERSIBLE BRAIN DAMMAGE, if brain blood pressure cannot be adequately maintained by physician.

3. It is my general understanding from ANESTHESIA AND THE BRAIN monograph, that on occasion, but NOT ALWAYS, the physician, pre-apprised of certain " regions " of poor oxygen brain metabolism or blood flow [i.e. at regional focal ischemia], may mechanically REGULATE CARBON DIOXIDE blood chemistry, to enhance low blood pressure in the brain, during medical risks in general anesthesia, suggesting the PORTENT of gauntlet-like irreversible fluids accumulations, in or ajacent to pre-standing brain pathology.

4. It is my additional understanding from your textbook, that the general anesthetic chemicals, used at Mayo faculty, possess FUNCTIONAL VARIABILITY of physician pre-notation avail, at the DEGREE of both OXYGEN metabolism brain tissue suppression, and at the suppression of brain blood pressure.

5. It is my general understanding from Michele Brignole, M.D. (1997) and from Professor Gerrard Gebber, Ph.D. at 1970 Michigan State University Department of Anesthesiology, that MEDICAL RISK in brain oxygen perturbations AT BARO-REFLEX FUNCTIONAL

disturbance, may suggest APPROPRIATE CONCERN IN GENERAL ANESTHESIOLOGY during the portent of OXYGEN METABOLIC DYSFUNCTION WITHIN THE EXACT BRAIN REGIONS THOUGHT TO REGULATE CADIOVASCULAR BLOOD PRESSURE STABILITY BY BARO-REFLEX.

6. It is my general scientific understanding from animal experiments exerting artifically induced deprivation of oxyxen to the brain, that vital BRAIN FUNCTION IS believed to be destroyed through both a chemical process, causing RELEASE of neurotransmitter chemicals into brain tissue and through complement of fluid accumulations and resulting physical pressures upon those vital brain regions.

7. It is my additional understanding that CERTAIN RESPIRATORY CONTROL CENTERS of the brain, are located at GREAT PROXIMITY to the BARO-REFLEX cardiovascular control centers of the brain.

8. It is my understanding through copy-permissions grant from Dr. Sheldon H. Roth, author of MOLECULAR AND CELLULAR MECHANISM IN ANESTHESIA, that the chemical substances used in general anesthesiology, DO POSSESS A GREAT VARIATION of supressive effects upon the oxygen metabolism of the EXACT ACETYLCHOLENE brain nerves, generally believe to govern FUNCTIONAL BARO-REFLEX.

9. It is my understanding that at Wellcome Neuroscience in Scotland, chemicals for pre-general anesthesiology safety prophylaxis exist to PRE-REGULATE OXYGEN METABOLISM at some degree of clinical efficacy for patients who are at medical risk for oxygen brain suppression and/or

death or injury therefrom.

10. Hence, it is my estimation that by 1998 medical standards of knowledge in anesthesiology, that any medical risk posed by virtue of symptomatic baro-reflex paralysis, may be physician managed at some degree of medical risk suppression, **contingent** upon physician ASSENT to NOTE baro-reflex physical impairment, pre-anesthesiology.

The Undersigned remits notarized proxy to medical standards rebuttal avail before individual member of the Mayo Faculty of Medicine, at the Signator's challenge upon this medical faculty, to refute at medical knowledged capacites, the Undersigned D.V.M. at professional interpretation of medical science's reasonably accrued 1998 standards, convening probable medical risk as may be preventable, during general anesthesiology upon any patient manifesting pre-anesthesis symptom of standing baro-reflex paralysis of acetylcholene type neural function.

This request for Mayo Faculty Proxy at general medical risk standars of 1998 knowledge is declared reserved to appendix before 1998 Petition unto the United States Supreme Court.

Signed before Notary for the State of Wyoming on June 24, 1998 by:

AT SIGNATURE:
J. Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61

Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084

AT NOTARY FOR THE STATE OF WYOMING:

AT SIGNATURE OF:

PATRICK P. MONTOYA, Seal of Wyoming

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1997

J. FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA, PETITIONER,

VS.

THE U.S. EXECUTIVE ET AL, RESPONDENTS.

*

THE PETITIONER AFFIDAVIT AT FAIR INCLUSION BEFORE THE COLORADO ATTORNEY GENERAL, AT COLORADO REVISED STATUTES APERTURES IN USURY EXTENTIONS UPON THE U.S. CONSTITUTION IN MEDICAL RISK PURPRESTURES ANALOGS

*

The Undersigned Petitioner remits Notary Affidavit compliance with Supreme Court Rule 29(4)(c) Signed at 28 U.S.C. 1746 and states the following:

1. On May 26, 1995, the Sovereign of Colorado did file motion to civil file P49019, suggesting that C.R.S. 24-10-

109(1) might prohibit the Denver Counry Judiciary from legal intervention in diagnostic fraud, later found to pre-construct medical risk purpresture in general anesthesio- of the brain stem.

2. On May 26, 1995, the Defendant Sovereign did additionally commit menacity before the Colorado Judicial Agent, the Honorable Mr. James B. Breese, at medical standards foreseeability.

3. On July 9, 1995, the Petitioner did move orally before the Colorado State Judiciary, Civil Division III., requesting the Judiciary's SEGMENTAL RULINGS STIPULATIONS, which were then scheduled for July 21, 1995.

4. On July 21, 1995, the Colorado Judiciary did comment to the Petitioner during dismissal of non-prejudice, that his estimation of greatest weighting to his decision to abstain from Order upon the Sovereign, was that the Petitioner had failed to to report medical symptom AS AN INJURY to the Colorado Attorney General, under Colorado Revised Statute, C.R.S. 24-10-109(1).

5. In 1998, the Petitioner did open the Transcription upon Denver County Civil File P49019 at July 9 & 21, 1995 procedings, and therein discovered that the Colorado Judicial VERBAL RULING at C.R.S. 24-10-109(1) had been ommitted.

6. The Petitioner's June 16, 1998 personal inquiry to the Denver County's Clerk, suggested that the recorded matter may or may not still exist under Court's procedures, pending the advent that the 1995 Colorado Sovereign may have effected INSTRUMENTAL USURY

from Colorado Revised Statute, upon the U.S. Constitution at various Articles, permitting by Sovereign statute, the discretionary judicial medical practice of legally suggesting that a medical SYMPTOM would constitute a legal INJURY under Sovereign assent to diagnostic purpresture, during PAID Petitioner Contract for specifically designated physician services as referred FROM INTERSTATE medicine to the Colorado Sovereign.

7. Upon general review of Denver County Civil Division III. File No. P49019, the Petitioner notes that the Court made inquiry to the EXTENT OF CONTRACT WITH THE SOVEREIGN, but did abstain to determine IF the Sovereign had LIED to the Court in medical standards FRAUD.

8. In September 1995, the Petitioner did file validated Claim to Colorado Secretary at C.R.S. 24-10-109 et seq. unto advent in U.S. Constitutional usury.

9. On June 16, 1998, the Court's Clerk, at 1515 Cleveland Place, Denver, Colorado, did refer the Petitioner to WRITTEN INQUIRY before Mrs. Kathy Ellerbee, to determine IF the electromagmetic recordings were available for transcript re-certification upon Civil File P49019.

The Undersigned re-stipulates Signatory Certification to this Affidavit as affixed under compliance with 28 U.S.C. 1746 testiment under Supreme Court Rule 29(4)(c), applicable to potential U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE AT COLORADO SOVEREIGN STATUTORY USURY BY C.R.S. 24-10-109(1).

The Undersigned certifies to the U.S. Supreme Court Clerk, that under penalty of perjury at 28 U.S.C. 1746(2), the facts herein declared before the Colorado Attorney General are true and correct. The Undersigned additionallt certifies to the Supreme Court Clerk, that on June 19, 1998, the Undersigned did forward correct photocopy of this Affidavit and its declared APPENDA,to the foregoing Party of Sovereign Office or the Office's current Occupant, by U.S.P.S. Certified Article No. Z 425 038 511, at Fair Inclusions to medical adversity purprestures analogs under Supreme Court Rule 14 or additional Court Rules applications:

Colorado Attorney General Norton, OR
OFFUPANT, 1525 Sherman Street, Fifth Floor, Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: 303-866-3617,

The Undersigned declares the foregoing APPENDA to this Affidavit.

1. The Notarized Petitioner Letter of June 17, 1998 to Denver County Court Agent, Mrs. Kathy Ellerbee
2. The Notarized Petitioner Letter of June 18, 1998 to U.S. District Court CHIEF Deputy Clerk Ehrlich of Denver

SIGNED BEFORE NOTARY ON JUNE 19, 1998
AT SIGNATURE:
J. Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084
AT NOTARY WITNESS TO SIGNATURE:
Jenna Asprey, Seal of Wyoming

J.F. Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wy. 82084
June 18, 1998

REFERRED AT U.S. SUPREME COURT AFFIDAVIT
AT FAIR INCLUSIONS UNDER U.S.
SUPREME COURT RULE 14 OR OTHER RULES

REFERRED TO U.S. DISTRICT OF COLORADO
CIVIL FILE NO. 96-D-2506

AT PLAINTIFF JUNE 10, 1997 SEAL OF
TRANSCRIPTION BEFORE U.S. POSTMASTER
JOAN MARUSICH

TO:
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK EHRLICH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1929 STOUT STREET, RM. 145
DENVER, COLORADO 80294

Dear Mr. Ehrlich:

In an entity matter before the Court, refer-
at the above Docket number, Avery Woods
Transcriptions, Inc. did forward to me
at Tie Siding, Wyoming, a transcription
upon December 18, 1996 Hearing by U.S.
Magistrate Judge Donald E. Abram. I
affirm to your Office that I did SEAL this
document on June 10, 1997 before U.S. Post-
master Marusich, and thereafter to this
action, I did remit the transcription by
U.S.P.S. video recorded deposit in Laramie,
Wyoming, to your Office of Court Clerk, 1929
Stout Street, Denver. Colorado. Hence, I
affirm to your Office on June 18, 1998,
that I have not personally reviewed the
content of this transcription of December
18, 1996 U.S. District Hearing.

On June 17, 1998, I affirmed before Mrs. Kathy Ellerbee, that upon 1998 aperture of particular transcription of Denver County Court 1995 legal matter pre-associated in Sovereign Colorado entity subject matter before U.S. Colorado District File No. 96-D-2506, that I noted not only SEGMENTAL RULING OMISSION from Denver County Court transcription, but that I additionally had noted with intent to correct, a MIS-PORTRAYAL to elemental falsehood unto my personal response before Sovereign Colorado Judicial interrogation at the LOCATION of my license to practice in veterinary medicine. Correction of subject matter at errors in transcription is associated at general professional ethics and maint-ainence of proper personal characture before State boards of professional licensure.

An additional purpose, beyond maintenance of good professional license characture remains SUBSCRIBED to this June 18, 1998 affirmation to U.S. District Clerk.

Within the Orders subscribed by the Honorable U.S. Magistrate Judge Abram, subsequent to the Pre-Trial Order, there existed NON-LEGAL APPOSITION by the honorable U.S. Magistrate, upon the personal nature of the Plaintiff's December 18, 1996 dress and personal mannors, referred to Mr. J.F. Lauslega. While these comments by Mr. Abram were undoubtedly stipulated to Mr. Abram's discretion, their TENURE before the more serious matter of Sovereign Colorado revised statutory disruption to U.S. Constitutional law, appeared at suggestion of the honorable magist-rate's non-essential PORTRAYAL upon the

non-legal diversity subscribed by plainiff's PROBABLE diffidence unto the Court, during requisite of plaintiff attendence at a Hearing, which had been Clerk scheduled, at error, for December 18, 1997, during the plaintiff's residence in Alabama and during both inclement weather and plaintiff ill-health.

Thus, during Denver County Court transscription PORTRAYAL of Mr. Lauslega at elemental LICENSE LOCATION PERJURY unto the Colorado Judiciary, the Undersigned is understandably concerned that the Avery Woods Transcription of U.S. District of Colorado December 18, 1996, HEARING, may additionally or substantially MIS-PORTRAY the verbal conduct of the U.S. District of Colorado Plaintiff at legal issues before the Court at Sovereign Colorado entity deportment in medicine.

Hence, the Undersigned affirms before U.S. District of Colorado Chief Deputy Clerk, the Undersigned's brief recall at personal memory of the December 18, 1996 Hearing:

1. Upon the Undersigned's entry into the Court, the Undersigned did verbally GREET the Magistrate Judge, at initiating politesse unto the early morning venue, and did not seat until so invited by the U.S. Magistrate.
2. Thereafter the U.S. magistrate directed the Undersigned by the brief suggestion to " present ".
3. The Undersigned did not immedia-

tely comprehend this verbal order, and thus introduced himself to the Court by prompt upon initial mis-comprehension.

4. To the best of the Undersigned's recall, the Hearing proceeded at Plaintiff presentments, absent to additional Plaintiff oral entity pleadings referral, judicial inter-rogations upon the Plaintiff usages in medication, Plaintiff accedence of intent to maintain Alabama domicile, and Defendant's PARTICULAR RELIANCE upon Will v. Michigan, at Sovereign Colorado C.R.S. USAGES IMMUNITY before the U.S. Constitutional questions presented by Plaintiff Lauslega.
5. At the recall of the Undersigned, the U.S. Magistrate ordered that the Defendant Sovereign Colorado prepare the Pre-Trial Order during Plaintiff/Defendant inability to convene the Order in mutuality.
6. The Undersigned requested that the U.S. Magistrate accept and review a particular letter of ethics to the Sovereign Agent, Mrs. Joanne McDevitt, which was written in red ink. The U.S. magistrate affirmed that he would " not have any problem " with the color of the ink, during CONFIDENTIAL FILE Magistrate-declared intent of review of the Undersigned's ethical stipulations unto Mrs. McDevitt.

The Undersigned, under penalty of perjury, stipulates at 28 U.S.C. 1746(2), & affirms the veracity of these June 18, 1998 declarations before United States District of Colorado Deputy Clerk Ehrlich, and thereafter certifies that these declarations were remitted to Deputy Ehrlich by June 18,

1998 Certificate of Mailing by the Undersigned, from the Wyoming City of Laramie.

Signed Before Wyoming Notary on June 18, 1998 by:

Hand Corrected Erratum at Page 1, AT SIGNATURE:

J. Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084

NOTARY SIGNATURE WITNESS BY:

AT SIGNATURE WAIVA J. ALMENDARAS
SEAL OF WYOMING

P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming
JUNE 17, 1998
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Mrs. Kathy Ellerbee
Civil Division III
Denver County Court
1515 Cleveland Place
Denver, Colorado 80202

REFERRED: UNTO CIVIL ACTION 3P49019 AT
U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL PURPRESTURE APERTURE
FROM COLORADO REVISED STATUTES LEGAL REMAINER

Dear Mrs. Ellerbee:

I came to your Office on June 16, 1998 to review the electronic magnetic recordings from which TRANSCRIPTION was made upon the referred file. I have noted RULING OMISSION from segmental Ruling Plaintiff oral motion, at July 21, 1995 ORAL RESPONSE by the Honorable Mr. James B. Breese. The matter is at C.R.S. 24-10-109(1), and may be bound to Supreme Court Rule 14 or additional Rules. I wish to listen to the tape with my transcript present, and append any omissions at transcript to Sept. 1995 Validated Claim to Colorado Secretary. While the transcript is generally a satisfactory mirror of the Court's proceedings, I note that the transcription suggested I had AFFIRMED to the Denver Court, my PRIOR practice in Colorado, locally. This is materially UNTRUE, as I am licensed only in the States of Washington and Maryland. Please advise me if this elecronic record is still available for IN-COURT AUDIT.

I have submitted appologetic matter to Mr. Breese's potential inconveniance. Thank you.

Under 28 U.S.C. Section 1746(2), I declare the above subject matter as certified true and correct under penalty of perjury.

Signed:

J. Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.

AT SIGNATURE:

Notary at 28 U.S.C. 1726(2):
AT SIGNATURE OF STACY SIMPSON,
SEAL OF WYOMING

NOTARIZED AFFIDAVIT BEFORE:

Mrs. Verna N. Muckle, Criminal Division,
At Proxy for U.S. Attorney General
c/o Mrs. Marcia W. Johnson, Legal Counsel
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
Suite 2200, Bicentenial Building
600 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

AND BEFORE:

The Honorable Mr. Tom Lantos,
Democrat from California
Member, House Judiciary Committee
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Under 28 U.S.C. 1746, the Undersigned Affiant certifies under penalty of perjury, the foregoing statements as true facts, stipulated as indicated to opinion, during U.S. Attorney General review of potential anti-trust sheltering within the United States Department of Health and Human Services, arising from two U.S. District Courts in Colorado and in Northern Florida:

1. In April 1998, U.S. Attorney General did appoint personal Proxy Verna N. Muckle from Affiant actuation disclosure remitted to U.S. Department of Justice, suggesting the portent of anti-trust legally pendent subject matter, sheltered at U.S. Northern Florida District Court Dismissal, at legal pendency from U.S. District of Colorado.
2. On June 23, 1998, the Affiant did receive two postings from the U.S.

Department of Justice, dated June 5, 1998 and June 10, 1998, construed by the Affiant as deferrals to the United States Judiciary.

3. At the June 5, 1998 correspondence, the Justice Department did note the Affiant access limitation to further U.S. District pleadings in the Northern Florida District, but did fail to note the additional U.S. District independent stipulation at possible Florida Lawfirm liability futures from potentially incomplete Affiant Dismissal of this firm, subscribed as the Lawfirm of Booker and Lassiter of multi-state licenses at the various Bars.

4. Referred in the matter of Affiant Judicial prohibition to practice at pro se before the Northern District of Florida Bar, the Affiant avers ongoing inability to obtain legal counsel, succinctly arising SUBSEQUENT to the March 1996 resignation of Mr. Byron A. Lassiter at contract with the Affiant. The Affiant inquiries for additional legal representation occurred first to Mr. Leon Ashford of Birmingham, Alabama, and thereafter through Escambia/Santa Rosa Florida Bar Association Director, Mrs. Diana Foote and through The Florida Bar Executive Director, Mr. Harkness from Tallahassee, Florida.

5. During Affiant unsuccessful attempts to secure legal representation in the subsequence of Mr. Lassiter's contract breach of 1996, plenary disclosure upon the legal refractions divisions were attempted by the Affiant unto the portent of attorney assents to represent the Affiant.

6. At pragmatic simile to the Affiant's foreknowledge of professional caste deportment in veterinary medicine, the Affiant sugests the opinion that the inability to secure additional legal representation subsequent to Mr. Lassiter's resignation, may have evolved at legal issues as were not disclosed to the Affiant, but may or may not have been segmentally disclosed by Mr. Lassiter, thereafter succintly ALLIGNED to the July 14, 1997 U.S. District Judicial independent stipulation of possible ongoing legal liability at the Court's bar, subscribed unto, or fore-reached WITHIN the activities of the Lawfirm of Booker and Lassiter before the United States Executive's legal interests at federal disability instument 260 72 6566.

7. On November 1, 1995 [date certain], the Affiant opened and reviewed Colorado physician testiment achieving suggestion of interstate contract manifest to anti-trust Sovereign physician deportment before the U.S. Executive. On that date, the Affiant was not apprised that such testiment might evolve at criminal statutes violation by Sovereign agency allignment with U.S. Executive co-liability from 15 U.S.C.15 Legislative enactment. The Affiant became aware of this statute on or about June 17, 1998. However in 1995, the content of the November 1, 1994 signed document appeared to mis-represent the Affiant. Thus, the Affiant inquired of his attorney, Mr. Lassiter, if the Affiant Signed Release of this document had been deposited to the U.S. Executive. Mr.

Lassiter steadfastly REFUSED response to the Affiant prior to and subsequent to his March 1996 resignation of contract.

8. On July 1, 1997, the Affiant received a certified copy of the evidence file at federal disability instrument 260 72 6566, which did not include the Affiant-released November 1, 1994 Signed testiment of University of Colorado physicians David Pollak and Jon Bell.

9. In September of 1996, the Affiant did Certify two letters unto the U.S. Surgeon General and the Social Security Inspector General, at medical adversity purpresture upon federal disability instrument 260 72 6566.

10. On October 24, 1996, the Office of the Social Security Inspector General did certify the Affiant inquiries of September 1996, as remitted to the dispositions of the HHS Inspector General. Thereafter, the HHS Inspector General did forfeit dispositions response to the Affiant.

11. At potential U.S. Legislative statutory enforcements interest beginning at 15 U.S.C. 15, the Affiant requests any U.S. Legislative interest in the above Affidavit, at proper reserves unto the dispositions of the United States Judiciary; however, the Undersigned Affiant pledges full and co-operative written response unto either the U.S. Department of Justice or unto the U.S. Legislature at any future inquiry from the date of this Affidavit's Signature.

Signed on June 24, 1998 before State of Wyoming Notary, and certified at Signature, as remitted in true and correct photocopy, U.S.P.S. First Class on June 24, 1998 to the parties indicated above:

AT SIGNATURE:

J. Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084

At Notary for the State of Wyoming:

AT SIGNATURE OF:

PATRICK P. MONTOYA,
SEAL OF WYOMING

AFFIDAVIT OF DISCLAIMER

BEFORE PROFESSOR WILLIAM J, NOWACK, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA, MOBILE, ALABAMA, AND BEFORE LAWFIRM OF BOOKER AND LASSITER, P.C. OF PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFIES THE JULY 10, 1998 U.S.P.S. FIRST CLASS DEPOSIT OF THIS AFFIDAVIT AT CORRECT PHOTOCOPIES UNTO THE ABOVE PROFESSOR AND LAWFIRM, AND AVERS THE FOLLOWING BEFORE WYOMING NOTARY JENNA ASPREY, UNDER 28 U.S.C. 1746(2), AT PENALTY OF SIGNATORY PERJURY:

1. On August 31, 1994, the Undersigned was informed by Nurse Reins of Cardiology Associates of Mobile, P.C., that the Office of Professor Nowack had cancelled the vaso-vagal reflex examination schedule of October 10, 1994, as disclosed in WRITTEN INTENT for examination to Booker and Lassiter Firm by the Signature of William J. Nowack.
2. The Undersigned claims no personal knowledge of the relationship between Professor Nowack and the Lawfirm of Booker and Lassiter as of July 10, 1998, owing to cancellation of $ 150.00 precontract Affiant consent by Professor Nowack on August 31, 1994 before Ms. Reins.

AT SIGNARTURE J. FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA

AT SIGNATURE JENNA ASPREY
SEAL OF WYOMING

THE AFFIDAVIT OF JULY 6, 1998
AT 28 U.S.C. 1746, SUBSCRIBED
BEFORE:

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO COUNSEL
1250-14TH STREET, SUITE 840
DENVER, COLORADO 80202

THE UNDERSIGNED AT NOTARY, JEAN FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA, SWEARS UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY, THAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES AT SEPTEMBER 9, 1994 MEDICAL REFERRAL CONTRACT ACCEPTANCE BY THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, FROM MEDICAL REFERRAL DISTRIBUTED FROM CARDIOLOGY ASSOCIATES OF MOBLE ALABAMA P.C., IS TRUE AND CORRECT IN FACT AND IN SUBSTANCE.

AFFIDAVIT:

1. The August 1994 medical examination upon the Affiant by Cardiology Associates of Mobile, P.C., did result in direct physician referral to the Office of C.U. Department of Neurology Chairman, explicit upon the legal interests of the U.S. Executive, in autonomic dysfunction medical complaint by the Affiant before Alabama private medical license, stipulated by Alabama physician as a component of baro-reflex AUTONOMIC physical disturbance in FUNCTIONAL neurocardiology.
2. At the August 1994 cardiology testing by Cardiology Associates of Mobile, P.C., no physician attempt

was undertaken to " carotid pressure " examination upon the Affiant, nor did eyeball compression testing therein occur in August, 1994.

3. In May, 1994, the Affiant did request C.U. Faculty examination upon the Affiant at appropriate BARO-REFLEX testing upon the Affiant, and in August, 1994, C.U. Neurology practitioner Barbara Calhoun did write to the Affiant, and did suggest the intermediation of Ms. Linda Subry for establishment of medical examination.

4. Upon Affiant contact with C.U. medical referral Office of Co-Ordination, Kate, the Affiant was respectfully informed that the C.U. Department of Neurology did NOT ACCEPT self-referred patients, and that therefore, the Affiant AT ALABAMA CARDIOLOGY, would be required to telephone C.U. physician to establish medical referral examination.

5. On September 9, 1994, upon Affiant provision of C.U. neurology departmental telephone number as that of Ms. Linda Subry, Secretary to Chairman Roy Wright, M.D., Cardiology Associates of Mobile did REFER to C.U. Agency at Chairman of Neurology Office, through Ms. Trisha Dixon, the Alabama physician referral request TO CONFIRM BARO-REFLEX Affiant medical complaint.

6. The Affiant did arrange medical appointment schedule of September 28, 1994, through CONTRACT PRE-PAYMENT DEMAND, by C.U. Officer Ms. Jackie di Fiori, and examination did occur on September 28, 1998 by Timothy J. Allen, M.D., consulting with David S. Madison, M.D.

7. One day PRIOR to the examination schedule, the Affiant did purchase an instrument of Polar brand heart rate monitor to FACILLITATE M.D. exam.

8. On the Date of September 28, 1994 dual physicians interview by Dr. Allen and by Dr. Madison, neither Dr. Allen nor Dr. Madison did attempt BARO-REFLEX PRESSURES TESTING upon the Affiant, to observe whether or not the Affiant's heart rate would slow at PHYSICAL NORM upon such pressures; however on the date of September 28, 1994, Dr. Allen did assert verbal promissory reserves to the Affiant, that his additional medical referral might establish pharmaceutical usages review upon the Affiant's medical complaint in baro-reflex failure at the brain area known as the nucleus solitarious.

9. On November 1, 1994, Dr. Allen's medical referral to C.U.'s Dr. David Pollak did occur. On that examination date, Dr. Pollak did not appear conversant at pharmaceutical management of baro-reflex symptomatic failure.

10. On November 1, 1995, the Affiant did open and review the written report of Dr. David Pollak, wherein Dr. Pollak did DISCLOSE that Dr. Allen had made interstate verbal contact with the Affiant's cardiology physician, whereupon at Dr. Pollak's interpretation, the matter at Alabama MERIT OF REFERRAL to C.U. Chairman of Neurology Wright, was set forth to interstate physician argument, dissent, or reserve at legitimate causation for the stipulated September 1994 referral.

11. Subsequent to the September 9, 1994 Alabama physician referral in AUTONOMIC NEUROOLOGY to C.U. physician RECEIVER, Roy Wright, M.D., BUT PRIOR to the September 28, 1994 C.U. medical examination at PAID contract, the Affiant avers to have remitted to C.U. Department of Neurology Staff, the written Affiant acknowledgment that the U.S. Executive's LEGAL INTERESTS stood at medical claim reserves, to potential award of Federal Disability instrument to the Affiant.
12. During 1995, the Affiant avers that the Colorado Judiciary did rule at verbal stipulation, that the majority RESTRSINT AT DEFERENCE TO ORDER C.U. physician prognostic medical services at outstanding BARO-REFLEX pre-paid Affiant contract, was substantially founded at the Affiant's FAILURE TO REPORT INJURY to the Colorado Attorney General under Colorado Revised Statute 24-10-109(1).

UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY STIPULATED AT 28 U.S.C. 1746, the Undersigned affixes Signature, Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M. before State of Wyoming July 6, 1998 Notary Witness, re-affirms the subjective veracity of the Affidavit at Signature hereupon, and certifies before the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court, that this ORIGIONAL Affidavit was remitted to the foregoing Counsels of Record for the Sovereign of Colorado during 1996-1997 U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado Civil Action No. 96-D-1506, by U.S.P.S. First Class Certificate of Mailing dated July 6, 1998 from the Wyoming City of Laramie unto:

Mr. Stephen Zweck-Bronner, Esq.
Mrs. Joanne McDevitt
Mr Simon Lipstein,
University of Colorado Counsel
1250-14th Street, Suite 840
Denver, Colorado 80202

SIGNED ON JULY 6, 1998 AS

AT SIGNATURE:

Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084-0061,

BEFORE SOVEREIGN OF WYOMING NOTARY:

AT SIGNATURE OF JENNA ASPREY,
SEAL OF WYOMING

THE PETITIONER CERTIFICATION OF LINEAR UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP FROM THE **SIXTH U.S. CENSUS**

The Petitioner claims linear U.S. Citizenship before the U.S. Executive's **attainders at U.S. Constitution and U.S. Treaty Executive E, 95-2,** before the United States Supreme Court's October 1997 Term, upon the foregoing U.S. Citizens, restraining at such claim, any particular capitolization upon the historical attributes gained or forfeited within the foregoing listing at direct or indirect familial lineage

1. Mr. Thomas J. Foley of New Orleans
2. Mr. Mary Bonner Foley of New Orleans
3. Gen. and Mrs. F. Bogart of Washington
4. Mr. and Mrs. William Senitt of Pensacola
5. Sgt. Earnest Seifert of Waldenburg, Germany
6. Mrs. Albertine Bonner Seifert of Ft. Lyon, Colorado
7. Mrs. Ellen Seifert Cook of Pensacola
8. Captain Walter Hugh Cook of Hamilton Ontario
9. Mrs. Luceille Angier Hughs of Atlanta
10. Mrs. Marie Angier Smith of Atlanta
11. Lt. Col. Walter Hugh Cook of Atlanta
12. Mrs. Eleva Carleton Cook of Atlanta
13. Mr. Calrton N. Hughes of Houston
14. Mr. Victor R. Smith of Atlanta

SIGNED J. FRANCOIS LAUSLEGA, D.V.M.

AT GREAT SEAL OF WYOMING NOTARY ON JULY 21, 1998

THE AFFIDAVIT OF JULY 6, 1998
BEFORE:

GENERAL COUNSEL
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
475 l'Enfant Plaza West
Washington, D.C. 20260-1200

REFERRED AT U.S.P.S. DISRUPTION UPON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO AT DUE PROCESS TO F.R.C.P. RULES EQUITY CONTINUANCE AT U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL FEDERAL QUESTION LEGAL ESTUARY AT MEDICAL RISK, INITIATING ON MARCH 31, 1997 FROM THE FLORIDA CITY OF PENSACOLA AT CORDOVA CONTRACT STATION

AFFIDAVIT:

The Undersigned avers herein foregoing, under penalty of perjury, that the the following Affidavit subscribed on July 6, 1998 before Sovereign of Wyoming Notary Witness, is true and correct in fact and in substance.

1. On October 28, 1996, the Affiant avers that Civil Action Number 96-D-2506, did convene in U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado.
2. On March 31, 1997, the Affiant avers to have remitted to U.S.-P.S. pre-paid contract for proper delivery at first class CERTIFICATE OF MAILING, the Affiant's responses to the defendant motion for protective order, Affiant co-subscribed to Affiant compliance under F.R.C.P. Rule 9(a) at

negative averments EVIDENTIARY COLLECTIVES to due process furtherance at civil action 96-D-2506.

3. In April 1997, U.S. Magistrate D.E. Abram, did declare by Magistrate Order, the Court's NON-RECEIPT of the Affiant's March 31, 1997 responses unto civil action 96-D-2506, and thereafter DID ORDER GRANT of defendant's motion for protective order.
4. On May 5, 1997, the Affiant did FILE at U.S.P.S. Pensacola, Florida main post office, before Staff member Beth, the proper order of forward during continued U.S. District of Colorado process at 96-D-2506, to U.S. Postmaster delivery custodies at Zip Code 82084-9998.
5. At date proximity to the May 5, 1997 Order of Forward from Pensacola Florida Zip Code 32503, the Affiant did inform U.S. District of Colorado Clerk, of the proposed Affiant address change.
6. On the approximate date of June 13, 1997, the Affiant was informed of U.S. District of Colorado Dismissal, posted from Denver, Colorado on May 21, 1997 to the Affiant's non-attended Florida residence at Zip Code 32503.
7. In July, 1997, the Affiant did receive U.S.P.S. photocopy of UNSIGNED ORDER OF FRAUDULENT FORWARD to Pennsylvania, posted from Pensacola, Florida U.S.P.S. DOCUMENTS ESTUARY BY Customer Relations Agent, Mrs. Nora Lyons, suggesting that the ORIGION of DUAL DATES F.R.C.P. PROCESS fraud upon civil action No. 96-D-2506, did occur initiated AT PENSACOLA FLORIDA, prior or DURING Affiant 82084-9998 zip code residence.

The Undersigned Affiant re-certifies veracity upon the above Affidavit's SEVEN TITLES IN AVERMENTS at 28 U.S.C. 1746, under penalty of perjury, and additionally does certify to United States Supreme Court Clerk, that this Origional Affidavit of July 6, 1998, before U.S.P.S. General Counsel, was deposited as Notarized within the Sovereign of Wyoming, to the foregoing Party, by U.S.P.S. First Class deposit on July 6, 1998 to:

U.S.P.S. General Counsel
475 l'Enfant Plaza West
Washington, D.C. 20260-1200

SIGNED ON JULY 6, 1998:

AT SIGNATURE:

Jean Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.
P.O. Box 61
Tie Siding, Wyoming 82084-0061

AT WYOMING NORATY SIGNATURE WITNESS:

AT SIGNATURE: JENNA ASPREY
SEAL OF WYOMING

THE JULY 22, 1998 NOTICE OF
UNCONSTITUTIONAL COLORADO
SOVEREIGN STATUTORY MISUSAGE
CLAIM AT UNITED STATES SUPREME
COURT RULE 29(4)(C)

AT LEGAL NOTICE UNTO:
OFFICE OF COLORADO ATTORNEY GENERAL
1525 SHERMAN STREET, FIFTH FLOOR
DENVER, COLORADO 80203

Body of Notice:

[redacted], initiating on May 26, 1995,
during venue 3P49019, Denver County
Court Civil Division III, and thereafter
AFFIRMED at segmental judicial ruling
on July 21, 1995, suggesting orally,
that the Undersigned was explicitely
legally liable for having failed to
report injury to the Colorado Attorney
General. The Undersigned avers before
intent at U.S. Supreme Court Claim, that
September 1995 VALIDATED CLAIM at
diversity of U.S. Constitutional issues
was submitted before Colorado Secretary
of State, pursuant to July 21, 1995
Colorado Sovereign segmental oral ruling.
The June 19, 1998 affidavit, submitted
by the Undersigned, avers under penalty
of perjury, that the Colorado Sovereign
judiciary did issue the indicated segmental
oral ruling stipulation at the State's
onus and furtherance of assumption of
injury to the Undersigned.
SIGNED J. Francois Lauslega, D.V.M.